

THE DOCTRINE OF IVSTIFICATION CLEARED,

By Animadversions on Mr. John Goodwins Animadversions upon Mr. George Walkers Defence of the true sense of the Apostle, Rom. 4.3,5 &c.

Together with an examination of both parts of his Treatise of Justification.

Wherein the imputation of faith in a proper sense is denied, and the imputation of Christ's righteousness Active and Passive affirmed, against that Treatise.

By Henry Robrough, Rector of Leonards Easte-chape London.

Respondes : Lutherum caluniam facit, non enim hoc sensu quo ipse fingeat dixit fidem id est qualitatem fidei esse formalem nostram iustitiam, sed Metonymico sensu dixit fidem, id est, Christum fide apprehensum, esse iustitiam nostram.

Quem sensum (metonymicum) si oppugnat adversarius, certe non Lutherum impugnat, sed Spiritum sanctum blasphemat, qui Christum expresse vocat nostram iustitiam, Jer. 23.6. & I Cor. 1.30. Parens Caltig. Bellarm. J. 2.c.4.p.428.

Iustitia meriti sensu non est tantum sanguis & mors Christi, sed complectitur totam obedientiam humiliacionis ab articulo conceptionis usque ad mortem crucis, ad Parens de act. & Pass. just. p. 186.

Etsiam Evangelica iustitia est legis impletio, neque pregnat cum lege per Evangelium enim Lex non abolesetur, sed stabilitur, Urs. Cat. p. 391.

For you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poore, that ye through his poverty might be rich. 1 Cor. 8. 9.

LONDON,

Printed by R.C. and are to be sold by John Bellamy and Ralph Smith, at the signe of the three Golden Lions in Cornhill, neare the Royall Exchange. 1643.

TO A MIRTHFUL LIT

THE MARCH MONTAGUE

BY RICHARD BRINSFORD

WITH A DEDICATION TO THE AUTHOR

BY JAMES WOODS

WITH A DEDICATION TO THE AUTHOR

BY JAMES WOODS

LONDON: PRINTED FOR T. CROWTHER,

AT THE SIGN OF THE ROSE AND CROWN IN

NEW BOND STREET.



To his Worshipsfull, loving, and
well beloved friends, Alderman Bunce
and his loving Consort Mistris
Sarah Bunce.

ADAMS sinne was a great
one doubtesse, I thinke the
greatest of all; some except
the sinne against the holy
Ghost. I am sure the whole
Creation groaneth under it, and travelleth as in
paine for it at this day, especially the little
world, mankind: The evils which are up-
on our bodies, soules, goods, names, are
hence. Hence diseases on and in the body
innumerable, the freeing us from which,
and putting it in an equall temper, taketh
up the Art and industry of the Physician;
and when he hath done all, there will be
a dissolution of that earthly house. *Dust*
thou art, and into dust shalt thou returne againe.

The divine is Gods special ordinance
for the soule, & (blessed be God) there is a

complicat remedy in that way for the
soule, the saving of the soule, beginning,
consummation, and body too in the glori-
ous resurrection, the salvation prepared to be
revealed in the last times.

A maine part of salvation is *Justificati-*
on, just making; by it such as beleeve are *hol-*
unreprovable, unblamable in Gods sight, *white*
as Snow, and whiter, *perfected for ever;* so are
all those that are sanctified. God dealeth with
them as such, pardoneth all sinnes, freeh
from guilt and punishment properly so
called, whatsoever is compensatory or fa-
tisfactory, and giveth them eternall life.

Hence peace with God, rejoicing in hope of
glory, glorying in tribulations, against Adams sin,
the death caused by it; servitude to sinne,
freedom from righteousness, the power
that was, and the reliques, yea and those of
omissions, & commissions, against the worlds
accusations, condemnations, the Devill and
conscience. It is God that justifieth, who can
condemne, who can lay any thing to their charge?
Physitians agree not about the cure of the
body, nor Divines about this of the soule.
Some differences there are about other
things,

it is about that by which, the forme, or what is instead of it, some give it *faith imputed in a proper sense*, so the *Anima d'queror* I deal with sometimes, sometimes remission of sinnes, both which he calleth righteousness, (righteousnesse is confessedly necessary to justification) Papists no faith, hope, and charity; both make Christ the meritorious cause. It is his merit whence *faith is imputed and justifieth*; faith one, his merit, that *faith, hope, and charity, justifie*, so the other.

I deny faith, hope, and charity, yea, faith alone in a proper sense. Though I allow faith to be the instrument applying, that by which, I profess me my selfe a friend of *imputation of the Active and Passive obedience of Christ*; that as that obedience is the meritorious cause, so the matter, and that imputed, given or applied by God, the formal cause, or that which supplieth the place thereof: whilst some have beeene busie about other controversies of our times, and others in an eager persuite of war; I (having a little more leisure then ever before, not used to be idle) have laboured in this con-

troversie the clearing of it. My first and last thoughts of some to whom I should Dedicate this, pitched on you both, and I desire you to take it as a pledge of unfeigned love and thankfulnes for many loving kindnesses, for constant friendship. I hope the cause (being the constant tenet of all Protestants against Arminians and Papists) will defend it selfe; It is Iesus Christ's cause, he will never leave it. If in your perusal of it, it shall contribute to your establishment, to your peace and comfort in life & death, to your boldnesse in standing before Gods tribunall here and hereafter (which was St. Pauls desire, and the practice of all that did ever so stand) I shall have mine aime in this mine intituling it to you both, whom I truly love, which I earnestly desire and pray for, resting ever yours in all services of love to be commanded,

4. April 3. 1643.

HENRY ROBROUGH.



To my Reverend Bre-
thren, the Ministers of Gods Word
in the City of London, with all others.
labouring in that worke of the
Lord in other parts of
this Kingdome.

Reverend Sirs,

OU have here presented unto your
view, *Animadversions* on Mr. F. G.
Animadversions, and an examination
of his whole Treatise of *Justification*.
He hath appealed to some of you, and
I appeale unto you all. He asserteth the *imputation*
of faith for righteousness, and that in a proper sense,
denying the *imputation* of Christ's righteousness to
Justification.

Though he granteth faith imputed, to be that
whose object is Christ, p. 6. Tr. 1. and that it is its
office to bring us to fellowship with Christ, and of that
*justification and redemption which Christ hath purchas-
ed*, p. 5. ibid. and that it is essentiall to it to lay hold on
Christ, p. 14.

Yet he asserteth this faith not to be taken figura-
tively by a Metonymy or Metalepsis with respect to the
object, because it laies hold on Christ or Christ's right-
eousness, Tr. 1. p. 14. but properly and formally, p. 22.

36.41. & 44. &c. Yea, he saith, neither is the righteousnesse of Christ, the object of faith as justifying, p. 43. And that the righteousnesse of Christ (in the variety of the objects of faith used in Scripture) is not to be found in the least mention, p. 38. The Scriptures make not the least mention, or give the least intimation of such a thing, p. 43. there is no sound or intimation of the righteousnesse or active obedience of Christ, p. 39.

And though he saith (with what agreement to himselfe, let him looke to it) Not but that the righ-teousnesse of Christ is and ought to be beleaved as well as other things revealed and written in the Scriptures, and is of nearer concernment then other things to the maine, p. 39, binding and end D O

Yet it may be believ'd by such a faith as the Turks and Jewes have, p. 39. and so the creation of the world is propounded to be believ'd, and that Cain was Adams sonne, p. 43.

When as he denieth the righteousness of Christ, that that is imputed to us for righteousness, he addeth, But it is that for which righteousness is imputed, p. 17. that is, it procureth that our faith should be imputed for righteousness unto us, p. 18¹ plainly. The merit of Christ or of his righteousness hath so far prevailed with God on our behalfe, that by or upon our faith we shall be accounted righteous before him, which in effect is the same truth which we maintaine, viz.

Thar

The Epistle.

That God for Christ's sake, or Christ's merits sake doth impute our faith for righteousness unto us, p. 21. and then, in this sense only, and not any other, may the active and passive obedience of Christ be said to be the righteousness by which we are justified, p. 13.

This faith (not in a figurative, but proper sense) is required and accepted for righteousness, and hath the same favours, rewards, and priviledges upon the tender of it that should have beene given to men in regard of that legall righteousness had it beene fulfilled, &c. p. 15. 16. It is as good, p. 6. as available and effectuall to justification, p. 15.

It is all that God requires of men to their justification in stead of the righteousness of the Law, p. 92. And therefore if God shall not impute or account it unto them for this righteousness, it shoule stand them in no steed at all to their justification, p. 92. Yea,

He calleth it from Phil. 3. 9. a righteousness which God himselfe hath found out, and which he will owne and countenance & account for righteousness unto men, and no other but this, p. 86. the righteousness there mentioned is as being and standing in faith, &c. and he calleth it a righteousness which will certainly carry it, notwithstanding all the unlikelihood and seeming imperfections of it, and that the thing is fully concluded and established with God accordingly, ib.

This is the Helena he contendeth for, in Preaching first, and now in Print. The condition appointed by God, and required on mans part, in opposition to Christ's righteousness, the object, which he denieth the object of this faith as justifying, p. 38. In this which is but inherent righteousness, a weake and imperfect righteousness, which must have help

to make it accepted, if ever it be so, in this I say will he be found not that which is by faith as an instrument, received and put on, and would have us to be so too, which God forbid. It will not stede us before Gods tribunall, his friend *Pareus* calleth it *Blasphemy against the holy Ghost*, as in the front is shewed; the Apostles text is for *faith of Christ*, and his righteousness, his righteousness being that which is imputed, *Rom. 4. 6. 11.* as I shall fully shew.

It is observable, that this which is here by him established, is notwithstanding by him also in effect confounded with remission of sinnes which with him *formally justifieth*. This he calleth the *imputing of righteousness*. To shew that God hath no other righteousness to conferre upon a sinner, but that which stands in *forgivenesse of sinnes*, Tr. 2. p. 7. That righteousness which God is said to impute unto men through *faith*, is nothing else (being interpreted) but *the forgivenesse of sinnes*, Tr. 1. p. 75. this (he saith) hath the priviledges, though not the nature of a perfect righteousness, p. 76. But let that passe, being fully considered in due places.

Againe, the thing he mainly opposeth, is the active obedience or righteousness of Jesus Christ, of this he saith, *amongst the variety of the objects of faith in the Scriptures, there is not the least mention as before.*

And (establishing the passive obedience as the meritorious cause imputed in its effects, now faith, now pardon of sinnes) calleth us, *That if Christ had fulfilled the Law for us in our steede, there had beene no occasion of his dying for us, and that there is*

no light clearer than this, Conclus. 7. Tr. 2. p. 10.

Yea though he calleth it an efficient remorse, not immediate, qualifying him to, but having no immediate influence, Tr. 2. p. 69.

Yet it is not causa sine qua non, with him; Causa si equa non, is causa solidata & occulta, onely present in the action, and doth nothing therewin, as Dr. Abbot against Bish. p. 497. Causa sine qua non, non est causa, as the Logitians. This is a remote efficient confessed, and so causa.

And for the active obedience of Christ in the production of this effect, Justification, Mr. John Goodwin, seemeth to me to lay enough to establish it in good earnest, and to have no cause of excluding the same, which yet he often doth.

We deny not the righteousness of Christ in it selfe, rather we suppose and establish it, p. 16, neither the absolute necessity of it, neither the meritorious efficacie or causality, in respect of the Justification of a sinner, p. 16. but beleeves, &c. we are justified for the merits sake of Christs righteousness, there being a full consideration in it, why God should justify those that beleeve in him. It is true, he meaneth the Passive righteousness chiefly, p. 16. which doth not exclude the Active.

Yea, that it falling into the Passive, and considered in conjunction with it hath influence into, and contributeth towards the justification of a sinner, as acknowledged on both sides, p. 7. That, together they may be called a righteousness, for which, but at no hand with which we are justified, p. 62. Wherefore they must be both together included or excluded, and in the same sort.

He will not have the Active and Passive righteouſſe ſeparated in respect of this common effect justification, p. 132. and ſaith, as the Active ſeparated will not profit; ſo neither will the Passive it ſelvē be found it ſelvē, that is an atonement or expiation of ſinne according to the will and purpose of God, except we bring in the Active to it, p. 132.

And elsewhere, Though it be not ſatisfactory ſimply and directly in it ſelf, nor contributing any thing by way of merit towards the justification of a ſinner, ſo that God is moved thereby to justify any man, (theſe are his hungry and cold; if conſiſtent, expreſſions) Yet it cannot be denied—but it hath a moving eſſiciency—qualifying in part the Sacrifice of Christ for the fulneſſe and height of acceptation with God, Tr. 2. p. 81. It was of abſolute neceſſity to qualifie and fit the Sacrifice for the Altar, to tender him a person meete by his death, and Sacrifice to make an atonement.—The abſolute holineſſe and righteouſneſſe of the humanity it ſelvē was of neceſſary concurrence thereto, p. 201.

There is great weight and moment in the righteouſneſſe of Chrifts perſon, to affure or ſecure the conſcience of men concerning their justification by his death.—It qualifieth his perſon at leaſt in part, for that meritoriousneſſe of his death, which may stand the world in ſteed for their justification, p. 204.

He acknowledgeth the infinite perfection and worſhip of it, p. 87.

And that the habituall holineſſe of his perſon and morall righteouſneſſe or Active obedience of his life.—are eſſentially and directly requisite to make his death and ſufferings, justification and life and ſalvation to them as hath beeene further opened in the former part

of this Treatise, Tr. 2. p. 34. These are to be considered.

It is true he teacheth us, that Christ's Active obedience, that of nature and life were due for himselfe. But will not consider that what is due cannot merit, he that doth all is but an unprofitable servant, he hath done but what he ought. And if the merit be destroyed, how can it make Christ a Priest, or his Sacrifice an atonement? how is it, in its selfe an atonement or expiation of sinne as before?

And what is become of our justification and salvation, yea of the glory of Christ?

You shall read dangerous doctrine about the imputation of Adams sinne, that is ours but in the effect, not the sinne it selfe, as his opinion is also of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, as if our spirituall death in which we were borne, supposed not our sinne, Adams, ours sinne by imputation.

Of Adams sinne he saith, (extenuating it much though he saith he doth it not) It is a sinfull sembling or miscarrying. Not out of envie, malice, or other sinister end or intention, which are the maine aggravations of a sinne, and rasing the offensiveness of it to the greatest height; but one of an inconsideratenesse or incogitance, which though it be no cloake for sinne, yet is it a roote of the least bitterness or provocation from whence it is lightly possible for sinne to spring, Conclus. 10. p. 19. 20. 2. Tr. Are you of this opinion of Adams sinne? I think otherwise, and in due place shew it.

And what doe you conceive of this in his fourteenth Conclusion. The sentence or curse of the Law was

not properly executed on Christ in his death. But his death was a ground or consideration to God whereby to dispence with his Law, to let fall or suspend execution of the penalty or curse therein threatened.— Neither did God require the death and suffering of Christ as a valuable consideration whereon to dispence with his Law, towards those that doe beleue more, or so much in a way of satisfaction to his justice, than his wisdom; for God might with as much justice have passed the transgression of his Law without consideration or satisfaction, p. 33.

What I conceive I tell you in due places. I beseech you interpose your selves to the settling of our brother. I perswade my selfe and know many of you are the same with our learned reformed Divinites, who whether they are for that I oppose, and in that name enemies of this imputation, I leave also the world to judge.

I professe my selfe amongst the friends of Imputation (as Mr. G. calleth us, 2. Tr. p. 147.) of the Active and Passive obedience of Christ; the opinion he holds, I also hate, (I thanke Christ) and as yet see no cause to change my judgement.

If Mr. Goodwin hath yet more to say in this cause, if he be more succinct, replying in a Christian and brotherly manner (which I earnestly desire) he shall finde me *cedere nescium*, ready for a further triall; and if in any thing I shall not agree with others, my reverend Brethren, and they shall lovingly advertise me of it, they shall finde me a lover and embracer of the truth shewed; *Homo sum, nihil humanum a me*

The Epistle.

*me alienum puto. I doe not willingly erre, a-
gainst all my failings. Thankes be given to God
for our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord our righteousesse.*

Your weakest Brother and
Companion in the work
of Jesus Christ,

HENRY ROEROUGH.

The

... van eenen vaders ziel
die niet meer leeft. En dat is een
vader die niet meer leeft.

Gelezen door de heer



The Contents of the first Part.

T He worth of the Doctrine of Justification.	p. 1
T he censure of Mr. G. opinion.	p. 5,6,7
D ivines against it, & Bezdins, & the heresies of Socinus, and opinion of Arminians and Papists, &c. p. 9,10. &c. 22,23.	
O bjections answered.	p. 17,18,19,20,21,22,61,62
M r. Walker is not an Arminian.	p.15
N or for your opinion.	p. 25,26
T he phrase imputing, defended as by Mr. Wr. p. 26. & 31,32	
I mputing an act of judgement and justice as well as mercy.	p. 28,29,30,35,36,37,38
I t is a judging of a thing as it is. Gods judgement is according to truth.	p. 30,33,34,35
A thing is the same with its selfe.	p.38,39
C hrist's righteousness Evangelicall, how?	p. 39
P assive obedience denied satisfaction to the Law; proved.	p. 40
C hrist by imputation a sinner.	p. 41,42
M r. Walkers contradictions not so.	p. 42,43,44,45
B elievers not redeemers from imputation of Christ's righteousness against Mr. Goodwins Popish inference.	p.45,46,47,48
M r. Walkers 1. argument.	p. 48. Sect. 11
H is 2. argument.	p.49. Sect. 12
3. Argument from 6. W. 21. verse, <i>hanc igitur</i> .	p. 55.
R ighteousness that by which justification.	p. 52. Tr. part. 2.107
J ustification by Christ's works not excluded by the Apostle.	p.54
I mputation of Christ's righteousness can't remiss of sinnes.	
I t is Christ's righteousness.	p.55,57,58
4. Argument.	p.58
5. Argument.	p.60
M r. Walkers 7. argument against M.G. unanswered or answered	
	but

The Contents.

<i>but by queries, are particularly answered.</i>	p. 82
<i>Ques. 1. whether faith, Rom. 5.1. be our obedience to the Law.</i>	<i>p. 62, 63, 64</i>
<i>Ques. 2. p. 64. Q. 3. p. 64. Q. 4. p. 65. Q. 5. - p. 65.</i>	
<i>Q. 6. p. 66. Q. 7. p. 67. Q. 8. p. 67. Mr. Wotton of union not reall. p. 68. Faith how an instrument. 68. Q. 9. about Gods justice. p. 69. Q. 10. p. 70. Q. 11. p. 71. Q. 12. p. 71. Q. 13. Christ's righteousnesse insufficient. p. 72. Q. 14. p. 73. Q. 15. p. 73.</i>	
<i>Justification by righteousnesse.</i>	p. 73
<i>Whether justif. in remission alone, Calvine.</i>	p. 75. &c.
<i>Remiss. effect.</i>	p. 80.
<i>Passive demonstrations from what outward.</i>	p. 81
<i>Q. 17. Adams sinne not imputed, Pelagianisme.</i>	p. 82. p. 83
<i>Q. 18. p. 82. Q. 19, 20, 21.</i>	p. 84.
<i>Faith a condition in relation taking in the object.</i>	p. 84. &c.
<i>Mr. G. 1. argument and answer.</i>	p. 89. 90
<i>2. Arg. ib. and</i>	p. 91
<i>2. Arg. p. 91. faith a worke in Mr. G. sense.</i>	ib.
<i>Q. whether to worship Christ or Mediator in the morall Law.</i>	
	p. 94-95, 96
<i>Q. 1. whether Christ needed justification for himselfe.</i>	p. 100. 101
<i>Q. whether bound to the Law for himselfe.</i>	p. 102. 103, 104, 105, 106, &c.
<i>Mr. G. first argument against the Relative sense.</i>	p. 110.
<i>Of Metalepsis.</i>	p. 110. 111
<i>2. Arg.</i>	p. 112
<i>See about 1 Cor. 1. 30. and 2 Cor. 5. ult.</i>	p. 113. 114. &c.
<i>3. Arg. p. 116. Abrah. faith, faith in Christ.</i>	p. 117. 118
<i>4. Arg. p. 121. answered. 5. Arg. p. 123. &c. 6. Arg. p. 124</i>	
<i>7. Arg. p. 126. Vii. Arg. p. 127. &c.</i>	
<i>On which side Authors stand, see</i>	p. 137. 149
<i>That Christ's righteousnesse be a meritorious cause, is not suffi- cient, see the Learned.</i>	p. 139. &c.
<i>That is a Robish and Arminian shifft. ib.</i>	p. 145
<i>Of Bucer. p. 150. Bullinger. ib. Luther cleared. p. 152</i>	
<i>p. 153. &c. & 159. Calvine. p. 156. Martyr. p. 160</i>	
<i>Pancius. p. 161. 162. Aretius. p. 163. Beza. p. 165. Ju- nius.</i>	

The Contents.

nus. p. 165. *Dollar Abbot and Mr. Perkins.* p. 166.
Dollar Preston. p. 168. *Forbes.* p. 170. *Musculus.* p. 171.

The Contents of the first part of his Treatise.

<i>Chap. 3. Answering other proofs from Scripture.</i>	p. 1. &c.
<i>C. 4. Workes of the Law are not absolutely excluded from Rom.</i>	
3. 21.	p. 10. &c.
<i>C. 5. Answering that from Rom. 5. 16, 17.</i>	p. 13
<i>C. 6. Arg. 5. from Phil. 3. 9.</i>	p. 18
<i>C. 7. That faith is imputed.</i>	p. 23
<i>C. 8. From Gal. 3. 12. being the last Scripture.</i>	p. 24
from transcribblenesse.	
<i>C. 9. Arg. 1. that Christ's righteousness cannot be imputed.</i>	p. 26
It is not fit.	
<i>C. 10. 2 Arg. It is too glorious.</i>	p. 31
<i>C. 11. It is by remission of sinnes.</i>	p. 33
<i>C. 12. From adoption.</i>	p. 35
<i>C. 13. From repentance.</i>	p. 39
<i>C. 14. About remission of sinnes, and prayer for it.</i>	p. 40
<i>C. 15. Compliance with Gods not seeing sinne.</i>	p. 42
<i>C. 16.</i>	p. 44
<i>C. 17. Three arguments more.</i>	p. 45. &c.
<i>C. 18. Three further reasons.</i>	p. 48
<i>C. 19. Five further demonstrations answered.</i>	p. 59
<i>C. 20. Answering 21, 22, 23, & 24. reasons.</i>	p. 63
<i>C. 21. Last reason.</i>	p. 66

The Contents of the second part of the Treatise.

<i>Chap. 1. 2. examined, being 14. Conclusions. Conclus. 1. p. 73.</i>	
<i>Conclus. 2. p. 74. Conclus. 3. p. 76. Conclus. 4. p. 77. Conclus.</i>	
5. p. 81. <i>Conclus. 6. p. 84. Conclus. 7. p. 87. Conclus. 8.</i>	
<i>p. 88. Conclus. 9. p. 92. Conclus. 10. p. 93. Conclus. 11. p.</i>	
<i>95. Conclus. 12. p. 99. Conclus. 13. p. 100. Conclus. 14.</i>	
<i>p. 100.</i>	

<i>Chap. 3. Examination of distinctions. Of Justification p.</i>	
<i>104. Of Justice. p. 105. Of Christ's righteousness. p. 109.</i>	

The Contents.

Of Imputation. p. 111. *Of obediencie to the morall Law.* p. 115. *Of Christ's keeping the morall Law.* p. 117. *Dist. 7.* p. 117
Chap. 4. *Examination of the causes of Justification.* p. 118
Christ's righteousnesse the materiall cause. p. 120. &c. *applied to be formall.* p. 125. &c. *Whether remission of sinnes be the formall.* p. 137.
Chap. 5. *Scriptures cleared,* Pg. 32. 1. *Examined,* p. 144.
Jer. 23. 6. & 33. 6. p. 146. Is. 45. 24. p. 148. Il. 61. 10.
p. 149. Rom. 3. 21. 32. p. 156. Rom. 4. 6. p. 156.
Rom. 5. 19. p. 161. Rom. 8. 3, 4. p. 165. &c. Rom.
9. 31. 32. p. 174. Rom. 10. 4. p. 176. 1 Cor. 1. 30.
p. 180. 2 Cor. 5. ult. p. 184. Gal. 3. 10. p. 187. Phil. 3.
9. p. 192.
Chap. 6. *Examining the answers to arguments against the Imputation of faith in a proper sense.* Argument 1. p. 193. arg. 2.
p. 195. arg. 3. p. 195. arg. 4. p. 197. arg. 5. p. 198. arg.
6. p. 200.
Chap. 7. *Our Arguments vindicated.* Arg. 1. p. 204. arg. 2.
p. 205. arg. 3. p. 207. arg. 4. p. 208. arg. 5. p. 209.
arg. 6. p. 212. arg. 7. p. 214. arg. 8. p. 223. arg. 9. p.
216. arg. 10. p. 218. arg. 11. p. 219. arg. 12. 219.

THE

The Doctrine of Iustification cleared by
 Animadversions on M. John Goodwins Animadver-
 sions upon M. George Walkers Defence of the
 true sense of the Apostle Rom. 4.3,5.&c. con-
 taining the two first Chapters of his
 "Treatise of Justification."

Sect. L



The Doctrine of free Justification is worthily, highly esteemed of, by all Orthodox Divines. As by Heretiques, (a) it is principally called into controversie: so by the other against them hath it beene maintained. When as they have entred lists with them, they have set the same amongst the chiefest Articles of Christian religion. The truth thereof professed and maintained in the Reformed Churches against Romanists, I finde stiled by one, (b) the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles of the chiefe Article of Salvation: who afterwards leaveth this also upon record concerning it. c Justification is a principle and hinge (as Bellar. with Pighius ingenuously confesseth) on which depend, or in which all controversies betweene us and the Pontificians are insinuated. Parvus calleth it, (d) besides others most necessary; and giveth this reason. (e) For this question (of the formal cause of justification) is one of the greatest, in which sacred Theologie is separated from Philosophy that is humane, the Gospell from the Law, the Church of Christ from Jews, Turks, Pagans, Protestants from papists. It was, faith he, & is the chiefe cause of the divorce which the Protestant Churches were inforced to make from the Roman Papacy. Learned Junius calleth it (g) as it were the kernal

The word of
 the dctrine of
 free justificatio.
 a Precept in
 controversy
 vocatur.

b Doctrinam
 Christi & A-
 postolorum de
 precipuo salu-
 tis articulo Dr.
 Prid. Lett. 5. de
 justif. p. 143.

c Justificatio
 principium est
 & cardo (ut
 ingenue cum
 Pighio agnos-
 cit Bellarminus
 de justif. l. 1. e.

d. a quo pen-
 dent, vel in
 quo versantur
 omnes inter
 nos & Pontifi-
 cioscontrover-
 sie. ib. p. 148.

e Prater cate-
 tas maximè
 necessariam.

f Est enim

questio hec (de formal i causa Justificationis) una ex maxinis quibus sacra theologia a Philosophia humana, Evangelium a Lege, Ecclesia Christi a Judaeis, Turcis, Paganiis; E-
 van gelici a Papato separantur. (f) Castrigat. de Justif. p. 364. Potissima fuit & est causa
 divorii, quod Ecclesiaz Evangelice annis ab hinc qz a Romano Papatu facere coacti fu-
 erunt, ib. p. 364. (g) Velut nucleus Evangelii & Consolationis caput. Thes. II.

(b) Gerhard. l. of the Goffell, and head of consolation. (b) Gerhardus, This place
de justis p. 435 is as a Castle and chiese Fort of the n^ole doctrine and religion,
 in s. l. p. 2. Hic locutus est tan-
 quam arx &
 p^rincipium
 propugnac-
 lum rorius do-
 ctrina & reli-
 gioni, quo vel
 obscurato, vel
 adulterato, vel
 subverso, im-
 possibile est
 puritatem do-
 ctrinae in aliis
 locis retinere :
 salvo autem.
 hoc loco, cor-
 ruunt per se
 omnes idolo-
 mania, super-
 stitiones &
 quicquid est
 corruptelatum
 in omnib. aliis
 locis. Ger. ubi
 supra, & Clem.
 & Lutero.
 (i) Hic locus
 est p^rincipius
 in doctrina
 Christiana.
 Clem. examp.
 231.
 (k) Cum nigra
 essem peccatis
 & per opera
 affinis essem &
 conjuncta te-
 nebris, me ful-
 chram fecit per pleate in Christ, and hence sinnes are pardoned. I cannot
 dilectionem sua
 pulchritudine
 commutata
 cum mea sur-
 pridine In sc. enim translati sordibus meorum peccatorum, me sua puritate impetrat,
 efficiens participem suz pulchritudinis. H. n. 2. in Cant. Greg. Nijen. (l) In statu quo-

inherent righteousness in this life; which if it were in them would be but justification by inherent righteousness, Popery, but by that which is farre exceeding, even the most perfect and exact righteousness and obedience of Jesus Christ. By this is the true beleever Just before God as Christ is, the beleever in him. (m) We are alike just, because with the same righteousnesse, though not equally, and in the same manner: He subjectively, we imputatively; He of his owne, we of his bounty. This judging of God and account, is according unto truth: deliverance from sinne and condemnation and acceptation to the favour of God follow righteously here; God's just in justification: Here feares, questions, doubts, &c. which are and may well be where there is nothing but inherent righteousnesse or faith in a proper sense, which are and arise in the minds of men, still moving men to aske where is the righteousnesse, are calmed and answered rationally. Here (if I be called to an account) I have to answere to scrupulous conscience, to the Devil, to God! which will serve before God, and is good in his righteous fight: a strong ground of comfort both in life and death. All Christians have experience (n) in a conflict; of how great esteeme to papists themselves in a conflict?

In all which names as a Christian, as well as a Minister of Gods word, I (the least of many thousands) may not be blamed if in this cause, for keeping the Crowne on the head of the Lord Jesus Christ I appeare and encounter gainefallers.

When as the whole world standeth ingaged in this controversie ile not withdraw my selfe. Ile give this golden Apple to none but Christ. If ever there was in me that which is as new Wine, bubling and striving to have its vent; If ever any word of the Lord was in me as fire, it is this, and it must have its went. I have beleaved and spoken comfort to others from hence, and I cannot but speake in this cause, especially being called thereto.

Sell. 2. I take not upon me the honour to be a defender of him who hath engaged himselfe in this cause, he is

(m) *Et que iustus sumus (sunt)* that learned Dr. out of the Chaira) quia eadem iustitia, licet non aequaliter, & codem modo; Ille subjective, nos imputative, ille de proprio, nos de illius largitate. Dr. Prid. ubi supra p. 171.

See Master John Goodw. as by Mr. W. & Mr. W. from p. 55. 1662.

(n) In agone; in agone quanti Papistis? satk Pareus, castig. de Justif. p. 363.

an old Souldier, and I think his work will beare him out. But as a wel-wisher ile offer my mite; and doe humbly crave leave of Master John Goodwin, to consider his reply to Master Walker, as I finde cause in his Animadversions, to animadvert, (p) We crave leave and will give it in like manner. In this let me be pardoned if I doe not walke in the same steps of Master Goodwin, that I profess the contrary in the beginning, (it is what he desireth in his second booke) that I Animadvert not on some and those the looser and fouler passages of his reply, as he professeth in the Frontispice of his booke, and promiseth to doe to Master W. I conceive that evilly to conduce to the cause, as well as to the Authours honour and worth, and respect in the world, and that it is but an indirect way to steale hearts after the Author of the Reply.

a. It is no praise in a Reply to meddle but with some passages, much leſſe with the looser & fouler passages: That is but a kind of cowardize, as the falling on lame, wounded, itragling parts of an Army: to leave the Army we should oppose in full strength. Little honour is gotten by the Captaine that doth and glorieth in this. These might have beeene neglected with more honour. The soundest and fairest passages in which strength lieth, should have beeene his ambition, not loose and foule ones, much leſſe the fouler and looser passages. It is ominous, indeed a stumbling on the threhold.

b. O that there were not too manifesta truth inthat passage of your Animadversions, and that so much paines had not beeene spent about foule and loose passages, there had not beeene so foule and loose a *Recipe*, the reply had not beeene so full of foule and loose passages, much labour might have beeene spared by him that replied, and those that reade and answer the same. I know not who can reade with comfort, or content. It suted not with a grave Divine, or so waigthy a matter as the chiefe Article of salvation.

It was not now a time in that manner to laugh or dance, in that manner to speake, to warre with such weapons;

*See the Front
of Master G.
book.*

pons; the Scriptures cited in the front are but abused. It was not a time of love, it relisheth of somewhat else, it will have a time of weeping and mourning before there be solid peace; such veines, how rich soever, yeeld much vanity; such *jesting is not comely*: the Prophets practise will not patronage such ironies as abound here. Our times have beeene times of licence under the name of recreation: and mans nature is foully degenerated that can recreate it selfe thus: It is not wisdome to make a pastime of sinne. The labour and strength to which, may well be suspected that is thus repaired. It were evill in transient words, for which yet we must give an account; it is worse in published bookees, which may continue with the world. It is an evill example, some adversaries will laugh, others blasphemie, the Lord give repentance for it to him that did it, and those that take pleasure therein.

You will say, he was provoked: It should not have beeene, had it beeene so, *wise men shoud have borne with* such as they account fooler; and it was neither wisdome nor strength to be overcome to such evill; *evill shoud have been overcome with good*; this had beeene to be approved of men, and acceptable to God. My profession is not to meddle with impertinencies, or to rake in fouler and looser matters, but in a humble manner to follow the cause, as God shall enable.

Nunc itaque & versus & cetera iudicra ponam;

Quod verum atque decens euro & rogo, & omnis in hoc sum.

Neither will I be a Patron of any evill word in any man, words against the person of a brother, or Christian man, let evill words be applied to evill things, and so farre forth I cannot much blame Master Walkers language. M.W. hath written or spoken little that way which hath not beeene written long before.

I could present the Reader with a large catalogue of such speeches.

The censure of
others.

Sibrandus Lubbertus against *Bertius*, that Prince of the Arminian band as you phrase him; holding Justification by faith in a proper sense against the figurative sense, which is yours, calleth it (q) *Detestable and abominable doctrine*. (r) *The damn'd heresie of Servetus*. (s) *Socinus his blasphemey*. (t) *The damned phrenesies of Servetus*. (u) *Servetus before you delivered it, so did Socinus and Osterodus, where he also citeth Bertius a witness that Arminius jumpeth with him*. (x) *Taken out of the blasphemies of Servetus and Osterodus, which all our Churches detest*. (y) *The abominable and accursed heresie of Servetus and Socinus, which is worse then Popish errors*. (z) *I say it is a blasphemous and blasphe and four times execrable heresie*. (a) *This thy position is the cause why I conclude, if you will be like your selves, you must at length with Servetus, Socinus, and Osterodus, destroy wholly the merit or satisfaction of Christ, and that you say that Christ neither attained righteousness to us, nor that we are justified by the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, for to what end is the righteousness of Christ if it hath not in it force to justify?* (b) *You write those things from whence those wicked and blasphemous abominations of Servetus, Socinus, and Osterodus, doe necessarily follow*. (c) *We heare every where learned men say that the Authors of this opinion have not enough put off Popery, they plainly say justification by faith in a proper sense, that is, our worke, to be the reliques of Monkish Pharisaimisme. This is certaine that Socinus and Servetus before him borrowed this of the Papists*.

(q) *Detestabilem & abominabilem doctrinam, Epist. p. 1.*

(r) *Dannatos Serveti haereticis, p. 5.*

(s) *Socini blasphemiam, p. 29. 33. 58.*

(t) *Dannatos Serveti furores, p. 26.*

(u) *Tradidit ante vos Servetus, fecit idem Socinus, & Osterodus, ubi etiam Arminium sicut sentire testem citat Bertius, p. 6.*

(x) *Ex Blasphemis Serveti & Osterodi, quas omnes Ecclesias nostras defensantur, desumptis, ib.*

(y) *Abominabilem & execabilem Serveti & Socini haereticis quae papisticis erroribus deterior est, p. 116.*

(z) *Dico esse blasphemiam & resque quaterque execrabilem haereticis, p. 121.*

(a) *Hec tua thesis est causa quare statuam vobis, si ramen vobis ipsi constare vultis, necessario cotidem deveniendum est ut cum Serveto, Socino, Osterodo, meritorum sive satisfactionem pro nobis factam omnino tollatis, dicatisque neque Christum nobis justificare peperisse, neque nos ipsius justitiam imputata justificari, p. 85.*

(b) *Illi negant Christi mortem esse satisfactionem pro peccatis nostris, ut denique negant illum satisfactionem nobis imputari, & nos illa nobis imputata justificari. Ita tibi faciendum est, p. 87.*

(c) *Quorum enim justitia Christi si non haberet in se vim justificandi, & si nos non justificaretur? id.*

(d) *Ponis illa in suis literis ex quibus impia illa & blasphema Serveti, Socini, & Osterodi bdelugnata necessario sequuntur, p. 87.*

(e) *Passim audimus viros doctos dicere Autores hujus opinionis Papismum non satis exsuisse; quin diserte dicere justificationem ob fidem proprie sic distam, hoc est, ob opus nostrum, esse ex reliquiis Monachalis Pharisaimi. Hoc certum est Socinus & aene cum Servetum hoc à Papistis mutuarum esse, &c.*

(d) *I deny not the Author of this writing to thinke with us and Papists, Christ to have satisfied for us; but which is grievous, wherof be prooveth this justification by faith in a proper sense, begiveth such arguments by which the merit and satisfaction of Christ are overthrown.* (e) *Those that wright these see the passage easie from this new Samsonatenisme to Popery.*

Consider how neerely these may concerne you Master G. who deny professedly the imputation of Christs righteousness to justification, as *Socinus* doth, which yet *Beretus* professeth, p. 104.

(f) *If I should follow I should follow not the truth, but a lie, not God, but Socinus, Servetus, Osterodns.* (g) *I wish the earth might open is mouth and swallow me up rather then I admit it.*

Beza (as Master W. citeth him) calleth it blasphemy, Master *Forbs de justificatione*, grosse impiety in placing it either in whole or in part in our righteousness as it is our owne worke, seeing by no worke of his owne can man possiblē be justified, p. 78. and p. 80. he saith, by this we may perceive that the opinion of these men who place our righteousness in faith properly taken as it is the all of our heart, without relation of it, as an apprehending instrument to Christ, is much more pernicious then the opinion of the Papists, p. 80.

Now it is certaine that if God shoud justifie us either by the workes of the Law, or by faith as it is a worke or habis in us, God could never be seene to be just in justifying of us, p. 29.

Which opinion can never be maintained with Gods honour, p. 163.

He calleth it a dangerous error, p. 171. and a manifest error, p. 193.

Hearken to *Pareus* (h) who saith, Which (Metonymicke) sense if our Adversary (Bellarmine) opposeth, truly be doth not impugne Luther, but blasphemeth the Holy Ghost, who calleth Christ expressly our righteousness.

(h) Quem sensum (Metonymicum) si oppugnar Adversarius, certe non Lutherum impugnar, sed Spiritum Sanctum blasphemat qui Christum expresse vocat nostram justitiam, 23. let. & I Cor. 1.30. Pareus Caglij. p. 419.

(d) Non nego
Authorem hu-
jus scripti no-
biscum & cum
Papistis sentire
Christum pro
nobis satisfe-
cisse: Sed quod
dolendum est,
cum hanc ju-
stificationem
per fidem pro-
prie sic dictam
probat; talia
adhibet argumen-
ta per quae
meritum & fa-
tisfactio Christi
profusa eventi-
tur, p. 98.

(e) Quihac di-
ligenter expen-
dunt vident fa-
cillimum transi-
tum esse ab
hoc novo Sa-
mosatenismo
ad Papismum,
p. 98.

(f) Si sequerer
non veritatem
sed mendacium
neque Deum
sed Socinum,
Servetum, & O-
sterodium seque-
ret, p. 117.

(g) Ego aures
ut me vel tellus
opem prius i-
ma deluiscar,
quam admittam,
sec p. 117.
So Sibrandus.

I my selfe cannot speake well of your cause, it were to call evill god, to procure a woe. *The justification of wickednesse, abomination to the Lord.* This is my judgement, I will indeavour to make it good by answering this reply, which I desire to doe without passion.

Sect. 3. It offendeth you that Master *Walker* calleth his interpretation *the true sense*; there was no cause untill he be refuted, and doe not you the same of faith in a proper sense?

What you, therefore, say they did of the *golden Calfe*, and of the practise of those that adulterate Coine, serveth your selfe as well as Master *W.* and may be returned; but of this let them judge who read: when they come to the end.

Neither doth he abate of the true sense or his confidence by adding, according to the common judgement of the most godly, learned, and judicious Divines of the best reformed Churches, that argument is your owne. You take upon you to prove a proper sense by authority, as of Ancient, so Moderne Divines; and thereby pretend confidence; Master *W.* might have so much leave as you take to your selfe, without the least diminution of his confidence. He may be farre more confident, if this be a ground; *the authority of judicious and godly Divines*, they are not for you, but Master *W.* I thinke I shall make it good by the time I shall come to the end of this worke, what you say.

Mr. G.

That there may be as great a difference betwixt the true sense and meaning of the Scripture, and the judgement of most godly and learned Divines, as is betwixt Heaven and Earth, and is in examples.

Answe.

1. Is not to purpose, unlesse what may be, be a truth of these Master *W.* meaneth.

2. It is evilly urged against M. *W.* when as your selfe use them to propre your owne cause, with such confidence.

3. It argueth weaknesse on your fide in the argument, and selfe conviction, when you urge Authors, you doe but pretend it and make a shew.

4. In

4. In my weake judgement your wisdome will be to give over that argument in this Name. I advise you to it, if it be not too late.

Whom Master W. meaneth by Divines you need not curiously to enquire, they are no *secret packe*, when he commeth to that part he nameth the men. *Luther, Calvin, Musculus, Bullinger*, are of those men, neither are they made by him.

When I found these mentioned by you in this cause, it put me in minde of the practise of *Berius* that *Prince of the Arminian band*, he for faith in a proper sense maketh the world beleefe that *Luther, &c.* were for his cause; but how vainely, *Lubbertus* sheweth, who disputing against that proper sense, for that which is relative and figurative, proveth it out of the same and other Divines. Let it please you to heare him, it may be what he saith concerneth you, though he be dead, to this purpose in that booke doth he speake unto you.

(i) *In that (the Relative sense) agree all our Doctors, Luther, &c. (k) Thou and Arminius deny it, I appeal to all our Doctors whether yee would not bring in some new thing into our Church. Where also he addeth. (l) Now I intreat thee to produce one, one, I say one Doctor of the Reformed Churches that teacheth the same.*

He giveth the testimonies of *Pareus, Dunnew, Ursinus, &c.* p. 15. 16. &c. The Palatinate Catechisme, *Chemnitius, Musculus, Hemingius, Eucamus*, p. 17. *Hesychius, Martir, Piscator*, p. 18. the *Augustiane and Belgike Confes.* and *Musculus*, p. 19. *Bucer*, p. 20. *Melancthon*, p. 53. 54. and 60. *Zanchie*, p. 62. and 76. *Pezelius*, p. 63. 64. Where also he repeateth his challenge to the same purpose as before. (m) Try thy strength and see whether thou canst bring forth but one, one, I say one place which teacheth this in cleare and manifest words.

ellus, Perkinsius. (k) Tu & Arminius negatis, provoco igitur ad omnes Doctores nostros an non aliquid novi in Ecclesiam nostram introducere velitis, p. 12. (l) *Jam per te abs te, ut unum, unum, unum, inquam, Doctorem reformatarum Ecclesiarum producas qui idem doceat. (m) Experi& vites tuas & vide an vel unum, unum, unum inquam, locum qui hoc claris & perspicuis verbis doceat adducere possis*, p. 6.

See Gerhard de
justificatione, p.
180. & p. 203.

(i) *In eo con-
sentient omnes
Doctores nostri,
Luther, Melancthon, Bren-
tius, Bucerius,
Cytrem, Hemin-
gius, Cabinus,
Zwinglius, Occa-
lompadium, Gry-
new, Bullinge-
rui, Oualterus,
Simlerus, Beza,
Danew, Zanchi-
us, Martir, Mu-
sculus, Ursinus,
Marloratus, lu-*

I will transcribe one passage more thence, and I intreat you consider whether it doth not concerne you in the same cause. *Sibrandus* having examined that argument of authority saith: (n) If thou wilt weigh these sayings which I have written out of the Doctors you alledge, thy conscience will tell thee that were either thou hast stumbled out of ignorance, or out of malice by a calumny given this opinion to them that thou mightest deceive the unskilfull or negligent, and mightest persuade them, those chief men, Luther, &c. to have approved and fomented the mad conceits of Servetus and Socinus, which you filily and secretly indeavour to bring into the Church; you should more truly say that you despising our Doctors, learned these things of Servetus and Socinus.

Parcus faith, (o) Which is the judgement of all Protestant Divines. And thus before I am aware I am come to consider whether the contrary exposition and cause built on it are not Socinian and Arminian?

(n) Si haec dicta que a doctoribus et allegatis exscripti expendes, indicabit tibi tua conscientia te hic vel ex infirmitate impedit, & horum scripta nunquam legisti, aut ex malitia hanc sententiam illis per calumniam attribuisse, ut imperitosque incertos falleres, illisque persuaderes summos illos vios Lutherum, Melanchthonem, &c. approbasse & iuvare Servetum & Socinum furor, quos vos calide & occulte in Ecclesiam introducere conamini. Regius dixeritis vos, spretis doctoribus nostris, hoc a Serveto & Socino didicisse. So Lubbertus.

(o) qua omnia Evangeliorum est sententia, castig de julfif. p. 368.

Self. 4. And here I profess it my judgement, that if the assimulation of you to Socinus, &c. be the inhuman practice of the tyrant Merentius, it is not Master W. but your owne fault, for your faces answer faces, and hands hands, in this question; and your selfe have coupled your selfe with these in this cause. Master Walker is but a discoverer of what he found, and in part is shewed to have beeene in Error by *Sibrandus*, as in his judgement of your opinion, and the last passages cited out of him in this cause. The shame that is in it, is from your selfe, and sorrow, which if you take not to your selfe, you may with sorrow and shame also goe downe unto the grave (as you speake.) If his Writs are greene (as you say) they will hold you the stronger; your Art in Writs did faile here, they are dry ones that snap asunder, they doe so without fire. Your Knift trush, (but why doe you reprehend it in Master W. and offend in the samething?) is error at the least, and will never deliver you, and though you be never so cunning (as you speake) in streiching an Tester-bookes, and doe your utmost, Dedalus sis, licet, mediscrissatum excidit & ruinam tantum ingeniosus videberis.

When

When as you tell us what you could doe if you sought revenge on the man, and of your confidence that you could make him hold up his hand to the Barre, to answere the crimes of Heretie and Blasphemey; none believe you but your owne Disciples, I doe not; you doe but beg him to be erraque, the intelligent Reader will judge these staines, militis glorioſi, and ſay, projeſt ampuſor, &c.

But (ſay you) what if Socinus and Arminius were of the ſame judgement with you in the interpretation of the Scriptures in question?

I ſhould think that cauſe ſufficient to ſay, that erraque Arminius (to ſpeak softly) and that berrique Socinus and your ſelte in this opinion are coupled, face to face, and hands to hands, that you are ad hoc gemelli, and what the learned in this have laid to their ſcore, lieth on yours alſo, and muſt stand there untiſſ you be acquited.

Neither is it Popiſh Mountabankery for M. W. to put you in their company, to number you amongſt them. Sibrandus did ſo by the opinion before him, and it was your owne fault to be ſo indeed. Your being ſo is rather Popiſh Mountabankery in the judgement of learned men, as before out of Sibrandus, as after shall appeare through our diſcourse; the weapons you uſe are for the moſt part merely Popiſh, you may be noted for it. We reade ſome taxed for going in the way of Caine; others for walking in the way of Salaaam: ſo long as there is a reall agreement betweene you and them, a man may ſay it.

Daniel was not by choyce with the Lions, he was with them as Lillies amongſt Thornes, as the Lord Christ betweene two Theeves, by Gods heavenly diſpoſition. You might haue bin ſo with theſe. No man would haue accounted you a Papift had you been cast amongſt Priests into the Gatehouse, or a Separatift for being in the ſame room with them, or for ſuffering ſimply with them. Contraries may be in the ſame ſubject, as flesh and ſpirit in the godly. You are brethren in the ſame evill, the man that runneth may ſee you the ſame in iudgement, and ſpeech, and opinion, in this Exposition of Scripture, as it is ſhewed afterwards. It were not

absurd to say, Daniel & the Lions agree in animality, or the Lilly with the Thôrnes in being vegetative. It is not affirmed of you that you agree in all opinions, and it troubleth us it is in this, this, we doe judge too much.

But Master W. did not first prove it erroneous before those imputations. That I confess should be done. Did we not doe both in one work? hath he not done it since? was it not done to his hands by Divines of the reformed Churches? by our owne Divines in Print, as well as in Pulpit, moved thereunto by your Preaching? If none of these be, the imputation is just so long as there is a reall agreement.

Have you not read it theirs before this, nor that it is censured as erroneous?

I think you have, and cannot be ignorant of this controversie betweene us and Arminians, I, us and the Popish party. Have you not read their hatred against this Tenet of imputed righteousness? read Gerhard. de justif. p. 234. (p)

Have you not read that the Obedience or Righteousness of Christ imputed to us by God apprehended by faith is the formall cause of our justification before God? Have you not read it affirmed and proved by ours against Papists?

I thinke I heard it from Doctor Davenants mouth, and I am sure he hath left this on Record to be (q) *The common opinion of all ours, neither for the substance hath any one written or thought otherwise.* And doth he not prove the same p. 363&c. he doth by many arguments.

(r) *Johannes Crotius, We say the imputation of Christ's righteousness to be the forme of our justification of Gods part, our adversaries taking the negative part on them, &c.*

Will Rainold. in I. contra Whiak. p. 314. vocat mathematicum solidianorum commentum, &c.

Andradius hanc Mediatoris justitiam fide nobis imputatam blasphemat esse communitariam, adumbratam & fictitiam, sic Chemnit. exam. p. 166. Ofius dicit novam & a seculo in auditam esse vocem, justitiae imputatiæ. Item justitiam Christi nobis imputari, nec in Canonice nec in Orthodoxorum libris regerit, p. 170. ib. (q) Communis omnium nostrorum sententia, neque quod ad rem attinet quicquam est nostris aliter scriptum aut sensum, De justi. hab. p. 312. (r) Disp. 8. Dicimus imputacionem justitiae Christi esse formam nostrae justificationis ex parte Dei, adversarii negativam in se suscipientes, &c. p. 334.

It is manifest by the state of the question laid downe by Papists and Protestants, and in this you agree with them. Have you not read faith to justifie against them in a Relative and figurative sense? and that as it taketh in the object, the obedience and righteousnessesse of Jesus Christ? See Master Perkins, Master Wotton, def. p. 166. stating the question betweene us and Romanists.

Did you never read Romanists in this controversie of justification, urging, Rom. 4. with your interpretation of a proper sense, against the Relative sense which the Protestants urge? Doe you not agree for the proper sense of faith against the Relative, and against the imputation of Christs righteousnessesse?

Untill you have answered all the arguments of the Protestant party, and so farre made good the Papists cause, you must be coupled with them. Sibrandus sheweth what men said of this opinion before, and I shall doe it often in this worke.

Did you never read in Fesius Hommissus this proposition gathered out of Arminius, (s) Faith, speaking properly, or that act of believing to justifie us, or to be the righteousnessesse by which we stand before God, and are justified. And, I say the very act of faith to be imputed unto righteousnessesse, and that in a proper sense, not metonymically, faith is accounted for righteousnessesse by Gods gracious esteeme.

A question is moved of the words of the Apostle Paul, Rom. 4. faith is imputed for righteousnessesse, whether they ought to be understood so as faith it selfe as an act performed according to the commandement of the Gospell, be imputed before God in or unto righteousnessesse, and that by grace, seeing it is not the very righteousnessesse of the Law; or whether that ought so to be understood that the righteousnessesse of Christ apprehended by faith be imputed to us for righteousnessesse, that is, figuratively and improperly: I indeed followed the first opinion in the theses of justification disputed under me.

tumquam astus, juxta mandarum evangelii praetitus imputetur coram Deo, in fine ad justitiam, idque ex gratia, cum non sic ipsam et justitia Legis, an vero sic intelligi debeant, ut justitia Christi per fidem apprehensa nobis in justitiam imputetur, id est, figurata & impropre: ego priorem sententiam sequitur sum in theibus de justificatione sub meis dispositis.

See Bellarm. de justif. l. 1. c. 17.
p. alterum argumentum, p.
997. & l. 2. c. 9.
1066. See Dr.
Dan. p. 370. 371.
Job. Croe. de
justif. imput. p.
354. & 420. &
335. & 343.
non relative
Papanis D. Prid.
p. 162. (s) Ad
Hip. Fidem pro
prie loquendo,
seu non credere
nos justificare,
seu esse justitiam
qua coram Deo
confitimus. &
justificamur.

Dico ipsum fidei actum, id est
non credere, imputari ad justitiam, idque proprio sensu, non
metonymice, sed
hinc pro justitia
habetur per
gratiosam dignationem Dei.
Declar. p. 65.
Quæstio moveatur de verbis
Apostoli Pauli
ad Rom. c. 4.
hinc videlicet
imputatur ad
justitiam, utrum
ea debeant pro
prie intelligi,
hinc ipsa hinc

(1) Arminius dicit fidem justificare ut aeternum, qui opis illud Dei est, Job. 6. atque ipsum non credere in Christum, nobis in justitiam imputari.

(2) Harmonium Remonstrantium & Socinianorum.

(w) T. credere nobis imputari p. 151. 152. 153

(x) Fides gratiose pro justitia habeti, &c.

(y) Iustitiam Christi non imputari in nostram justitiam coram Deo. Hom. p. 84. Pelt. p. 148. &c. through the whole three Paragraphs.

P. 33. de justif. (z) Lest. 5 de justif. p. 157. Alkerinus nos, negant pontificii una cum Socinianis & Remonstrantibus.

(*) Fides formatim causam statuente, vel in solidum, ut Arminius aliquis cum sequenti tradidetur, vel pro parte, quod Ecclesie Romane placuisse intelligo; de recon. p. 102. (a) Iustitia imputata quam a Christo habemus iustificari nos cum ipso contra Socinum ex quo agnoscimus. Gal. pars ult. p. 8. n. 36. p. 84. 4. (b) Moliuntur (Remonstrantes) quod Pontifices & Sociniani, &c. Ita ut hinc iustificemur non ratione quadam Meronymica, qua fides sic instrumentum, apprehendens iustitiam illam quam Christus nobis obediens fuerit acquisivit, quod quidem fidei officiant haec tenus in omnibus Ecclesiis reformatis tanquam ei proprium agnatum fuit, p. 143.

Where also you may finde other like passages taxed, and cited out of Vorstius, Bertius, and Arnoldus himselfe, who there p. 41. faith, (t) Arminius faith, faith iustificeth as an act, which is that worke of God, John 6. and the very beleeving in Christ, to be imputed unto us for righteousnessesse.

Doth not Peltius in his (u) Harmony of Arminians and Socinians instance in this point, (w) the believing to be imputed to us out of both? and shew in the next Paragraph the agreement of both in this, (x) Faith graciously to be accounted for righteousnessesse?

Do not both shew their agreement in this, (y) That the righteousnessesse of Christ is not imputed for our righteousnessesse before God?

Doth not that worthy Scholler Master Pemble shew the Authors of this tenet, Servetus, Socinus, Osterodus, Arminius? doth he not give it to Bertius, Vorstius, Episcopius, and Bellarmine? You could not but reade this in Doctor Prideaux, for you cite him. (z) We assert it, the Pontificians, together with Socinians and Arminians deny it, where he stateth the question.

In Mr. Wotton I finde those (*) That teach faith the formal cause, either wholly, or Arminius and his followers have delivered, or in part, which plesseth the Church of Rome.

(a) We with you equally acknowledge our selves justified with imputed righteousnessesse which we have in Christ against Socinus.

Let these passages out of the Censura of those praised Theologs of Leiden by you, p. 13. be observed, and it will be seene whether they are not of the same judgement with you.

(b) Arminians doe the same with the Papists, and Socinians, &c. so that we are not justified by faith, metonymically as

(*) Fides formatim causam statuente, vel in solidum, ut Arminius aliquis cum sequenti tradidetur, vel pro parte, quod Ecclesie Romane placuisse intelligo; de recon. p. 102. (a) Iustitia imputata quam a Christo habemus iustificari nos cum ipso contra Socinum ex quo agnoscimus. Gal. pars ult. p. 8. n. 36. p. 84. 4. (b) Moliuntur (Remonstrantes) quod Pontifices & Sociniani, &c. Ita ut hinc iustificemur non ratione quadam Meronymica, qua fides sic instrumentum, apprehendens iustitiam illam quam Christus nobis obediens fuerit acquisivit, quod quidem fidei officiant haec tenus in omnibus Ecclesiis reformatis tanquam ei proprium agnatum fuit, p. 143.

an instrument apprehending that righteousnesse which Christ got for us by the merit of his obedience, which office of faith as proper to it, hath beece hitherto acknowledged in all the reformed Churches.

Paul said, onely faith to be imputed to righteousnesse, and they adde of their owne that, that they may transforme a figurative speech into a proper one, and obtrude their interpretation, or rather error, for Pauls words, lest faith shoulde be taken by a metonymy or relatively, with its object, that is the righteousnesse of Christ apprehended by faith, but for faith is selfe in it selfe, which is accounted for righteousnesse by God. Socinus truly denieb Christ's righteousnesse to be imputed to us. Episcopius elsewhere expressed it, that it was not the righteousnesse of Christ properly that which is imputid.

By this time I hope you may be abundantly satisfied in this, neither is Mr. W. the onely censurer of your opinion, others have said as much of Arminius for the same as he doth.

See. 5. But when as (*) Mr. W. crieth out of Arminianisme, is not he himselfe the Arminian? surely (lay you) no two judgements ever jumped better together, the judgement of Arminius the Heretique, and Mr. W. the Erratique in the point of imputation.

Why, what faith Arminius? (c) He saith the righteousnesse of Christ to be imputed unto us and to be made ours in the gracious account of God, and that he supposed the same thing contained in the words of the Apostle. 2 Cor. 5. God made Christ sinne for us that we might be the righteousnesse of God in him.

I answer, yet Mr. W. is no Arminian: First, suppose he fully held the same with Arminius. It might not denominate Mr. W. seeing the tenet is his in common with all of the reformed Churches. Neither in that name, had it beeene a fault in Mr. W. to hold the same Arminius did, how faulty soever Arminius else, it is the substance of your owne answer.

id quod imputatur. Disp. 12. thes. 4. id. (*) Mr. Walker no Arminian. (c) Arminius in resp. ad am. impof. Justitiam Christi nobis imputari, & heri nostram gratuitam affirmatione Dei, & arbitrarie se id ipsum contineri verbis Apostoli, Cor. 5. Christum fecit Deus pro nobis peccatum, ut nos essemus justitia Dei in illo.

*Paulus dixit
tantum fidem
imputaram ad
justitiam, at illi
de suo addunt,
ipsam, ut lo-
quitionem fi-
guratam in pro-
priam transfor-
mant, & suam
interpretatio-
nem aut porius
commentum
pro iphs Pauli
verbis obru-
dant, ne vidu-
des accipiatur
Metonimice aut
correlative
cum suo obje-
cto, nempe ju-
stitia Christi
fide apprehen-
denda, sed pro
fide ipsa in se
quaz apud De-
um habetur pro
justitia, &c. p.
146.*

*Christi justi-
tiam nobis im-
putari negat
quidem. Scm.
iid. Episcopi-
us alio id ex-
presserit non
esse justitiam
Christi proprie-*

2. *Arminius* himself in that agreeth not with himself, &c. your selfe confess him and some of his followers much more to expresse themselves on the other hand, and to affirme the imputation of faith for righteousness, and not the righteousness of Christ.

(d) Sed non voluit idem esse Christi justitiam nobis imputari, & fidem nobis imputari ad justitiam. I-

mo ne: phrasin illam volebat probare, justitiam Christi nobis imputari ad justitiam.

(e) Fieri nequit, Deus Christum e jusque justitiam nobis imputari ad justitiam, mihi non probari dixi. Quicquid imatur ad justitiam, vel in justitia, vel pro justitia, id ipsum non est justitia stricte & rigide sumpta: at Christi justitia quam ille praestitit, est ipsius mea justitia stricte & rigide sumpta: ergo non imputatur ad justitiam.

3. You say sometimes, if so, it is more then once, name another time if you can; you might have said alwayes, else: So that there is farre more reason denomination should be from what is ever his fault (being so indeed) you constantly speaking with him, then that Mr. W. should beso stiled from his once.

4. Againe, doe you not clip his words? and doth not *Arminius* say more then you report in that point? and would he have these two, Christs righteousness to be imputed unto us, and faith to be imputed unto us for righteousness to be the same? and did he there approve that phrase *the righteousness of Christ to be imputed to us for righteousness?* which yet is Mr. Walkers, and of all Protestants. Those praised *Divines of Leiden*, having repeated what you doe out of *Arminius*, truly observe and adde. (d) But he would not that Christs righteousness to be imputed unto us, and faith to be imputed to righteousness, shoud be the same. Neither would be prove that phrase, *Christs righteousness to be imputed to righteousness.* Both which Mr. W. would have done. So that Mr. W. and he jumpe not together. Nay *Arminius* saith (e) It cannot be that God should impute unto us Christs righteousness. He professeth he followed the contrary in his Theses, in his Declaration, and ad art. 31. he saith, I said I approve not the righteousness of Christ to be imputed to us, whatsoever is imputed to righteousness, &c. that is not righteousness strictly and rigidly taken: but Christs righteousness which he performed is righteousness it selfe straitly and rigidly taken: therefore it is not imputed unto righteousness.

For my part I conceive that by his imputation of Christs righteousness, he meant not that, in it selfe, but in its effect, faith, the imputation whereof is the effect of Christs righteousness. Forsooth Christ by his righteousness

teousnesse merited that faith should be gratisiously accepted in the place of righteousnesse. So he constantly, and in the same sense answering to the question of a proper or figurative sense, he denieth the latter and asserteth the former, with an, I plainly thinke so, wherein he agreeth not with Mr. W. but your selfe; you are the men that jumpe together. These are a sufficient defence of him, they shew he doth not (as you charge him) directly maintaine what Mr. W. doth; there is palpable difference. Mr. W. saith that the righ teousnesse of Christ is imputed to righteousness. Shew me the same in *Arminius*, then I will yeeld they jumpe, till then you come short of your undertaking.

Ita plane sen-
tio.

Sel. 6. But Mr. W. in this, *Fairy-like*, leaves a chanleging to the Arminians, better favoured then their owne, giving them an opinion rather, then relating theirs, to make the Arminian tenet and yours to mee: forsooth the Arminians meane by faith not as Mr. Walker saith that grace onely consisting in confidence and assent, but an universall obedience to the will of God in all those duties which be requires of men in the Gospel.

Mr. G.

Answ. For the practise of *Fairies*, I never read of it, and if it be so I shall thinke better of them then I did. Those that tell tales of them, seeme to say otherwise, and I never heard of a well-favoured changeling before. But how prove you that to be the *Arminian* tenet? you answer from those Divines of *Leiden*, c. 10. Who challenge them for affirming the word faith to be sometimes taken in Scripture (g) for that whole and universall will of God, which before they said God would have performed by us, in which sense they would be taken and understood in this Chapter. 2. They are charged with *Pomifician* friendship, (h) In that they number works amongst the causes of *Justification* with faith by an equal right. And after to have drawn this their notion of faith out of the *Socianin* lakes. (i) We must remember this faith by which we are justified to be obedience of God. And after, in Christum credere, nihil aliud est, quam Deo ad ipsius Christi normam & pre scriptum obedientem se prebere: and after that by faith which they hold to be imputed for righteousness, they understand and meane fidem ipsam in

(g) Pro tota &
universa illa;
voluntate Dei.

(h) In eo quod
opera inter ju-
stificationis
causas numer-
rant, aequali cu-
fide jure.

(i) Meminisse
debemus fidem
hanc sc. qua ju-
stificamur, Dei
obedientiam
esse.

se quia apud Deum habeatur pro justitia, quatenus fidei nomine comprebenditur penitentia, resipiscens & in universum obediens a bonis Christiani.

Answ. To answer. First, were there a difference in Explication, yet there is agreement in the same thing faith; neither can you blame men for disagreeing in Explication who are therein notorious for agreement with Bellarmine, and disagreement with reformed Divines.

2. Though I might let them stand or fall by their Explication. Yet I must doe them right. Those Divines you name say that they involve all in ambiguities, as their manner is, so as one cannot easily attaine their mind; so that one may mistake them.

They doe not peremptorily as you, but doubtfully as inquirers affirme. (k) *Tet they seeme to meane that, and they seeme to take it with Socinus.*

Thus the Remonstrants in their *Apologie* answer those Divines, and observe the same. (l) *They dare not plainly proesse it, for they every where double that thare, they seeme, and conclude at length they may come nearer to Socintus then the reformed Church; and much more to that purpose, which you would not or did not see.*

To that question, (m) *Whether the Remonstrants make the essentiall forme of faith to be obedience, that of the works of the Law, and especially of the Gospel; they seeme to cleare the matter whilst they answer.* (n) *This is a manifest calumnie, this will not be proved done in their Confession, the contrary appertaineth in termes, for they always distinguish obedience properly called from faith, as the effect from the cause from which it floweth, as a River from the Fountaine, as the Child from the Mother, whereas Socinus thinketh otherwise. Arminius himselfe disclaimeith it, ad artic. 5.*

(m) An Remonstrantes hæci formam essentialem faciant obedientiam & quidem operum legationem, atque inquitianum Evangelicum. (n) Hæc præsa manifesta calumnia est. Nisi quoniam id à Remonstrantibus in confutacione eorum latum prohibatur. Contrarium rater in terminis. Nam obedientiam novarive obedientiam propriè distinx, que in Scholis ita vocatur, semper & ubique distinguit à fidei effectum à causa sua, à qua emanat ut ratus alioque, ut id hanc àmazet, contra quam Socinus faciendum esse sentit, p. 116. 2.

And when as they joyne workes with faith in justification, they say it is but a Grammaticall or Logicall controverie, and that the confessions of all reformed Churches acknowledge faith to be (o) living, not (p) dead, faith which bath jyned with it good workes, yea, which neither is without good workes, nor can be, to be that true justifying faith as they call it, which by that property is distinguished from historicall faith, temporary, and that of miracles, as they speake. Where also they urge out of those Censores, p. 132. (q) They plainerly assert obedience of workes necessary to justification, not indeed with necessity of efficacie, but of presence.

So that you say they say it, and your witnessnes that they seeme, and themselves deny it. Judge now whether Mr. W. giveth them a better opinion then they have to make you meet with them.

If they did so, Mr. Walker telleth you that they are more tolerable herein then your selves: you and Master Wotton: for it is more agreeable to justice and reason that God shoule count all graces of renovation for righteousnesse rather then faith alone in the proper sense, which is but one grace, and so Mr. Forbs also.

Finally, whosoever shall reade that Chapter, and the answer, and compare some passages with your opinions, will see you meete indeed; and that you desire not leave to dissent from those learned men for nothing. I could finde much observable. But I passe to what you relate out of Doctor Prideaux concerning Vorstius. Who saith:

He holds (r) *Faith is imputed immediately and formally, and the merit of Christ mediately and in effect.*

What is this but your owne opinion? You say faith is imputed immediately, and the merit of Christ but mediately, if at all. Roundly, you, in its effect, that is faith, which is imputed.

But there he addeth, (s) *By faith be farther strengeth he only understandeth observation of Christianisme, because to believe is to keep Christ's preceps, misber was be ashamed at lengib quia credere idem est quod observare Christi precepta, nec dispuuit tandem concludec fidem justificantem illam, eis illam inhaerentem justitiam quam Papistis urgunt.*

(o) Vivam.
(p) Mortuam,
hdem que con-
juncta libi ha-
bet bona ope-
ra,imo que sine
bonis operibus
nec est, nec esse
potest, eis si-
dem illam ve-
ram justifican-
tem, ut vocant,
qua ista pro-
prietate ab hi-
storica & tem-
poranea ac mi-
taculorum fide-
ri aiunt, distin-
guuntur.

(q) Diserte ob-
edientiam ob-
perum necessa-
riam esse ase-
runt ad justifi-
cationem, non
quidem neces-
sitate efficien-
cie, sed presen-
tie.

(r) Fides im-
putatur imme-
diate & forma-
liter, & meriti
Christi mediate
& effectiva.

(s) Per fidem
ulterius often-
dit se observa-
tionem Christi-
anismi folamodo
intelligere.

to conclude that justifying faith, to be that inherent righteousnesse which the Papists urge.

(1) Ulterius. This is given unto him alone by the Doctor, and with a(1) further; belike, in this he went beyond Arminius. So Arminius himselfe, and so the Remonstrants as before.

And I pray you is not faith obedience to Christs commandement and Gods worke? (as you both love to speak, in opposition to the morall Law, out of the 1 John 3. and Job.6. of which after.) And is not faith that justifieth in a proper sense the inherent righteousnesse the Papists urge in this cause by the same text? Rom. 4. The difference is.

Papists make it a part, the beginning, and give it to all the graces, you to faith alone, both are for a proper sense against the Relative one.

Ours call it grosse impiety to place toat righteousnesse, whereby we are justified in faith, in whole or in part, Forbs 78. And of faith properly taken, and without relation he saith, it is more pernicious then that of the Papists, p. 80. *Nec dum dispuuit.*

But, a little before he saith out of Corvinus, that Arminius was not pleased that faith should be called the instrumentall cause of justification, which is against what you teach.

(2) Bona igitur
fide dic Armini
pro iudic acumin-
ne, qua ratione
fides justificatur?
Tibi credere, hoc
est actum fidei
(dicte Arminius)
imputari in
justitiam, idq;
proprio sensu
non. Metony-
miae, quatenus
objectionem ap-
prehendit. E-
pist. ad Hippol.
this disagreemt.

It is true he saith not so, you do, and yet that which the Doctor there speaketh to Arminius, appertaineth to and toucheth you both. (3) Tell us in truth Arminius out of thine acute judgement how faith justifieth? The act of faith (saith Arminius) is imputed for righteousnesse, in a proper sense, not metonymically as it apprehendeth the object. If not as an instrument, How? So the Doctor answereth himselfe. So he denying, so you calling it an instrument, both teach the *no credere* in a proper sense imputed, for righteousnesse; both deny the figurative sense; you that teach it an instrument, deny justification by it as an instrument receiving and applying Christs righteousnesse to justification; The agreement being such, it had beeene wisdome to conceale,

You say he citeth *Bertius*, another Prince of the Arminian band; that he acknowledgeth (w) this opinion to exclude the merit of Christ, which is contrary to what you have taught and proteste.

If he be a Prince of the Arminian band; you are no common Souldier, but *ad hoc*, a Prince, as he, above him, a King. That he derogateth not from Christ he sheweth, (with what agreement to himselfe let him looke to that) (x) That faith respecteth the merit of Christ, and thus it is true which is said, faith justifieth not by it selfe, but relatively as it apprehendeth Christ and his righteousness: he is nearer the Protestant tenet in this then you, and if descent will make it, he leaveth you to be a King, you are lower or higher in that band. That faith in a proper sense is imputed, &c. he saith, and therein is but one of the Princes with you.

When as the Doctor saith (y) this opinion; he hath no relation to *Vorstius*, or that his opinion, of which before, of faith so taken. When as he saith *Arminius* his opinion to exclude Christs merit, it concerneth you. *Sibrandus* said to *Bertius*. (z) This your thesis is the cause why I conclude, if you will be like your selves, at length necessarily to come to it, that with *Socinus*, *Servetus*, *Osterodus*, you altogether take away the merit or satisfaction of Christ made for us, and say that Christ neither brought righteousness for us; (when you with *Arminius* preach yee are not justified by any righteousness at all) Neither that we be justified by his righteousness. *Bertius* laid not the latter; *Arminius* and *Socinus*, &c. did, *Bertius* must come to it. *Bertius* saith it of *Arminius*. For he layeth such foundations by which the merit of Christ is necessarily overthrown. For either it must be by faith in a proper sense imputed and Christs righteousness imputed, or one of them: If it be by faith in a proper sense as in your Doctrine, justification by Christs righteousness imputed, is excluded; and it is your Doctrine as this latter excludeth the proper sense of Faith. Indeed at best the merit of Christ, as a remoter thing, must be established, meriting that faith should be imputed, which is *Socinianisme*

(w) Hanc sententiam meritum Christi excludere.

(x) Fides ista meritum Christi respicit, atque hoc modo rerum est quod dicitur, fides justificationem per se, sed correlative, quatenus nimurum apprehendit Christum ejusque justitiam, *Sib. Ep. p. 144.*

(y) Hanc sententiam.

(z) Haec tua thesis est causa quare statuam vobis (h) tamen vobis constare vultis necessario tandem eodem veniendum esse ut cum s'etero, *Socino*, *Osterodo*, meritum Christi pro nobis factam omnino tollatis dicatisq; neq; Christum nobis justitiam peperisse. Neq; nos ipsius justitiae nobis imputatae justitiae, p. 85. Talia enim ponit fundamenta per quae meritum Christi necessariop eventitur, id.

anisme as *Sibrandus* sheweth out of *Osterodus*, p. 10. & p. 97. and that which was taxed by the *D. Elor* in *Vorstius*, but even now; see your 15. p.

Mr. G.

As for your charge on Mr. *W.* that he by his opinion of imputation of the active obedience of Christ's righteousness doth more trench on the merit of Christ's righteousness than your opinion, it is arraigning, arraigning, and finding full of guilt.

Answe. You shew not at whose suite, nor at what barre, nor in what. Neither can I divine which way it will appear, lesse you be the accuser, the witness, and the Judge in that Assise; open it when you please. Looke at home, you deny it to Christ's active obedience, as being Christ's debt, and Christ's passive obedience also, when as thereunto you doe call his active obedience as an essentiall requisite, though not without contradiction. Seeing *nihil dat quod non habet*, that which meriteth not, being debt, cannot make his sufferings to be so, of this in the answer to your treatises.

The other things which you say you could improve, p. 16. I passe and leave to the Readers to judge whether there be not Arminian blood in your tenent apparent, which is that the *ni credere* of *Abraham* in a proper sense is imputed denying the imputation of Christ's righteousness to justification: these are yours, they are of *Arminius* and *Arminians*, as before. In the words of *Sibrandus* I will adde. (b) *This same thing Servetus taught before thee, for he writeth, his faith was reputed to Abraham for righteousness.* (c) *And Socinus teacheth the same. When our faith is imputed to us for righteousness; the sense is, our faith is accounted for righteousness, when he teacheth righteousness to be imputed to us by Abrahams example. But therefore, because it seemed good to God to account our faith to us in the place of righteousness.*

(b) *Hoc ipsum ante te docuit Servetus, scribit enim, libro de lege & Evang. ut est apud Calvini in refutatione errorum Michaelis Serveti, p. 903. suum credere reputorum fuisse Abram ad justitiam.* (c) *Sci & Socinus hoc ipsum docet de Christo servatore, p. 388. ejus verba haec sunt, cum fides nostra nobis ad justitiam imputatur, sensus est, fides nostram pro justitia haberi. Cum justitiam Abram exemplo imputari docet, &c. sed ideo (nos iustos cotam Deo) quia Deo visum sit fidem nostram justitiae loco nobis ducere.*

Socinus

Socinus in one place writeth (d) *There is not a syllable in the Scripture of Christ's righteousness to be imputed to us. Abraham believed God, and for that cause was accounted just of him.*

Aud when as you detract not justification from the blood and merit of Christ, but give it the bloud and death of Christ, what doe you more then Osterodus & these are his words. (e) *So farre as that bloud and death worke in us those things for which God doth justify us, forsooth faith. I will conclude in Sibrandus words to Bertius. Out of which every one may see thee and Arminius to teach the same of justifying faith, which before you, Servetus, Socinus, Osterodus, wrote and preached. And if you desire to see farther agreement, see it in Peltius his Harmony de justif. par. 3. ¶ 4.*

Here is Arminian bloud, neither have you proved the same in Mr. W. nor can you, sift and examine as throughly as you will. When as you say Arminian faith imputed includeth obedience to the Law of God. You heare they distinguish it from workes, and you know, it is called by them and your selfe, *the worke of God, the commandement and condition of the Gospel* Mr. Ws. faith in the Relative sense indeed includeth the perfect obedience of Jesus Christ to Gods Law.

You say Arminian faith is performed in their owne person. So is yours: you say it was Abrahams faith in a proper sense as before. Mr. W. teacheth the righteousness of Christ applied by faith so to constitute us just as if we had performed it in our owne persons.

You say the Arminians faith excludeth Christs merit from justification. So doth yours as before; as that which is immediate, as that with which imputed we are just. You cannot say Mr. W. faith doth little lese; perfect righteousness is that which faith applieth in Mr. W. Doctrine, by which we are justified before the Lord.

When as you aske, if Christs righteousness and obedience be imputed to righteousness, what need there is of any satisfaction or atonement by bloud.

(d) Ne syllaba quidem in sa-
cri monumen-
tis exter, de
Christi justici-
a nobis immi-
putanda. Ut a-
pud Sibrand. in
cenfuis p. 463
& creditit A-
braham Deo, &
ob eam cansum
ab ipso iustus
habitus fuit, p.
463.

(e) Quatenus
sanguis ille &
mors in nobis
efficiunt eas res
propter quas
Deus nos iustifi-
car, nempe hi-
dem.
Ex his quilibet
vide potest iste
& Arminium
deinde docet de
inde iustificante
quod ante vos
Servetus, Soci-
nus, Osterodus
de illa scriptis
literis & viva
voce docue-
runc.

Mr. W. will answer you, both are debt, full satisfaction consisteth in them both.

Mr. J. Goodwin will tell you it is *an horious crime to divide Christ's righteousness; and that his alive obedience infloweth, and is in a sort satisfaction.*

When as you tell us you have wrung the best weapons out of the adversaries hands, you are but *Miles gloriosus*, (to continue your Metaphor) It was *sine hoste, tanta te jactat in aula.* And me thinkes those that teach this doctrine should not be professed enemies to you. The Church of England teacheth the same in her *Homily*, and the Articles of Ireland. *As great and as godly as the lively faith is (faith the Homily) yet it putteth us from it selfe, and remitteth, or appointeth us unto Christ for to have only by him remission of our finnes or justification,* 3. part. hom. salv. p. 18. 19.

When as the world was not able to pay, &c. It pleased God to prepare for us the most pretious Jewels of Christ's body and blood, whereby the ransome might be fully paid, the Law fulfilled, and his justice fully satisfied, p. 15. *So that Christ is now the righteousness of all them that truly beleieve in him, be for them paid the ransome by his death, be for them fulfilled the Law in his life, so that now in him and by him every true Christian man may be called a fulfiller of the Law; for as much as that which their infirmity lacked, Christ's justice hath supplied, &c.* p. 15. Is this tenet your adversary? It is the tenet of your Mother: It is not to know or acknowledge your Mother, to be her adversary, and an adversary to your selfe.

And though you thus part with *Arminianisme* now in words; you are found not to doe so indeed, and shall be shewed to doe so, to the end.

For the other grand heresies *Socinus* holdeth which you doe not; I know not that Mr. Walker laith them to your charge directly. It is good you should looke to consequences. *Sibrandus* gave *Berius* good cautions, p. 85. 87. 122. &c. In the imputation of faith in a proper sense, and denying the imputation of Christ's righteousness you agree, as *Sibrandus* to *Berius*, of which before; these he called blasphemous heresies.

See 7.

Self. 7. Here (passing many vain words, impertinences and froth) you say Mr. W. granteth p. 7. that Abraham resting on the Lord by firme faith for the performance of the promises made unto him, the Lord counted it to him for righteousness; and after, even faith was reckoned to him for righteousness; and after p. 14. whereby faith (he saith) he reneweth the holy spirituall faith and beliefe, which is before renewed to have beeene in Abraham, and which is proper to the elect and regenerate. What of this? It agreeith not with his opinion, it is not his tropicall or metonymicall faith, it is faith in the proper nature and direct signification; and so what have we to doe with the discourse following? he holds the same interpretation of faith with you.

Softly Sir, his interpretation is out of your mouth tropicall, in this I see no agreement with you, nor disagreement with himselfe.

By faith in Christ Abraham rested on God for performance of the promises, the word to him was, *In thy seed shall all the Nations of the earth be blessed, in him all promises are Yes and Amen.* He must rest by faith in Christ, on God for them; indeed in him he was Abrahams God, to him the promise is made first, in him, to us, if ye bee Christes, yee be Abrahams seed and heirs, &c. Gal. 3. 14.

This faith in Christ he saith was reckoned to him for righteousness, and the faith which apprehendeth and appliceth the righteousness of Christ is proper to the elect and regenerate, and is an holy spirituall faith and beliefe: there is no opposition to himselfe, or agreement with you, you doe but flatter your selfe, and deceive your Reader.

But faith so often said to be imputed for righteousness, Mr. W. cannot understand a tropicall or metonymicall faith, viz. the righteousness is evident (say you) because immediately after, p. 11. interpreting the word righteousness, he saith, by it is meant the righteousness of Christ, &c. so that if by faith we understand the righteousness of Christ, and by righteousness, the righteousness of Christ too, we must make the Apostles meaning to runne thus. The righteousness of Christ is imputed to a believer for the righteousness of Christ, an hyper absurdity.

(f) Christi iustitiam nobis imputari.

(g) Necesse est iustitiam Christi dicimus nobis imputari propter iustitiam Christi, que loquutio non modo *exaggerat* sed manifestam in se habet absurditatem.

The Remonstrants *Ad ipso. p. 113.* giving a reason why they used not the phrase (f) *Christi righteousness* to be imputed to us, give this reason, (g) *We must necessarily say that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us for the righteousness of Christ, which is not proper but absurd.* It was borrowed, *Discipulum te facili agnoscas.*

1. Faith in a tropicall sense is that which Mr. Walle teacheth with all the Reformed Churches.

2. The explication of Mr. W. is of righteousness imputed, which he saith is *that which faith laiceth hold of*, not those words, *to righteousness*, which you might observe to have a distinct interpretation given it by Mr. W. His words are *by imputing and accounting that faith for righteousness to Abraham, and every one of his faithfull seeds is because Gods setting of Christs righteousness on the score and putting it on the account of the believer, his judging them perfectly righteous.*

By that phrase *for righteousness*, is not meant the righteousness of Christ as you would fasten on him, nor perfect conformity to the Law, as in the first Covenant, personall righteousness of Abraham, but a righteousness by which the believer is *as if he had perfectly performed the Law in his person, in such a state, and had never sinned, by which the believer is just in the sight of God.*

A believer is not so by faith in a proper sense, that is not perfect righteousness, and cannot make a man so. But in a relative sense as it appelleth the righteousness of Christ active and passive, by which imputed, set on our score, it is that we are righteous, and so accounted.

Sol. 8. But let us come to the phrase of *imputing*, or *accounting*, and here Mr. W's. first fault is. *He makes a supposition, that to impute and account are universally termini aquilentes, to name always band in band.*

Answe. 3. He hath no such words in that place, there is neither universally, nor always.

3. If he did so, there is no misprision from his own Scripture instances.

Is bad not better good English (you say) I and my sonne Solomon shall be imputed offenders, and yet you must acknowledge to have offence imputed is to be accounted an offender.

Your selfe confesseth in some easies and fates of speach, they may be of indifferent use and signification, and in the case in hand to be expellions of good propriety, and that there is not much difference betwix them, except am in þis þe minde so cavill and wrang' about words. The man then that quarreleth these words must be conceived ex confessis, to have a minde to cavill and wrangle. Who then laieþ on tongue and multiplieth discourse? it is your phrase.

Bnt this is his great fault indeed, namely, the description he layeth downe of the sense of the phrase, imputing a thing to one, which description is this. The phrase of imputing accounting a thing to one signifieth þis in the Old and New Testament, an all of judgement and estimation by which a thing is judged and esteemed, reckoned and accounted to be as it is indeed.

These are his words, but he calleth it not a description once, as you doe twice, and so usually afterwards: forsooth, that you may examine it by the rules of a right definition, or description, as in your 2. exception, where you trie it by that Law.

But the bare giving of the sense of a word cannot be termed a description, neither is every description to be tried by the rules of a true definition, much leſſe every explication of the sense of a word; passe that, What say you to it?

Capiat qui patet est aspero, and confesseth his eloquence to passe your intelligence.

Mr. G.

Answe. Which surely is a wonder, when as he seemeth to explaine his speech to a common capacity. Doe not you know what it is to judge a thing to be as it is indeed? I would not have said so of you, his words following spell them more plainly when as he addeth þis it is just and according to truth. The judgement is so not when it is judged as it is not, but as it is; for that is unjust judgement

ment and not according to truth. Hee addeth, *Gods thoughts are alwayes just, and his judgement is according to trutb*, Rom. 2. 2. therefore a just imputing and counting is here meant, saith Mr. W. for God doth account of all persons and things, as they are. He giveth instance of an unjust account and false imputing, 1 King. 1. 21. and of true counting, Neb. 13. 13. and Levit. 17. 4. and Psal. 22. 30. and doe you not yet understand it?

Why doe you dispute against it, and condemne Mr. W. for it in the entrance, saying, *The man is no where liker himselfe then in the description*? Surely you can never justly judge him or his cause in dispute, if so be that you doe not understand him: you might have spared your 1. 2. 4. and last offset against what is said, and first have required Mr. W. explanation, that you might understand him.

These are but words; the fault is in your will: he putteth you to it, as we shall see in examination of your opposition.

You say, *I should have thought that Gods imputing faith for rightenesse (take faith in what sense you will) had beeene an act of grace and mercy in God, and not an act of judgement.*

1. By an act of judgement in Mr. W. sense you should understand, an act of understanding.
2. But I suppose you take it for an act of justice, for judgement the exercise thereof; and if, why may there not be in justification a concurrence both of mercy and judgement? and both not be exercised in making men just? I should have thought there is sweete agreement betweene them. I have read in one of our Homilies, that God in our redempcion and justification, with endlesse mercy joyned his most upright and perfell justice. Homil. salv. 1. part. That Gods mercy did not deliver us without a just ransome, p. 14. that when as it lay not in us to doe, he provided a ransome for us, that was the most precious body and bloud of his owne most deare— who besides his ransome fulfiled the Law for us perfectly, ib. that in this the justice of God and

and his mercy did imbrace together, ib. so that in our justification is not onely Gods mercy and grace, but also his justice, which the Law calleth the justice of God, and it consisteth in paying our ransome, and fulfilling the Law. The grace of God sheweth not out the justice of God in our justification, but onely sheweth out the justice of man, that is to say, the justice of our works, as to be means of deserving our justification, ib.

I have read of Justification freely by grace through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth a propitiation through faith in his blood to declare his righteousness — in it God is just and the justifier, Rom. 3.

When as faith is taken in a relative sense with its object, Christ and his perfect righteousness, and is imputed to Abraham for righteousness, Abraham is made just perfectly, God judgeth justly in accounting him so, in pronouncing him so, with this he may stand in judgement and be as if he had never sinned, as if he had perfectly fulfilled the Law in his owne person.

It is not so where faith is taken in a proper sense, neither is that accounting faith for righteousness a righteous judgement; or that which is in truth. Faith thus taken is a worke of the Law, (some thinke) a part of inherent righteousness, as charity, an imperfect grace, it cannot stand in judgement.

Faith in the relative sense establisheth the Law (as you shall see) bringeth in what it requireth, and so justifieth, and so justification is a worke of mercy and judgement.

I profess I could never endure what I read in Mr. Weston and Socinians, that (b) punishment and pardon are adverse, in some, nay in it selfe it is joyned with deniall of the satisfaction of Christ, and a destroyer of Gods justice. Looke you to it.

Justice shineth through mercy, Mr. Forbes, p. 92. and this of faith in a proper sense is against the justice of God, (as he) When as we are before Gods judgement-seat to be judged in the rigour of justice; then we must bring some thing that may countervale the justice of God, not onely acceptation in mercy, but also approbation in justice. (i) We must be just if we

(b) Perna & venia sunt adversa.

Perkins verba
Wot. in Bish.p.
174.

(i) Justos efficit
oporet si sumus
ei acceperit, Cal.
in Rom. 5. 13.

(k) Simul quia-
lis fit Christi ju-
stitia interpre-
tans, sum vocat
obedientiam, ubi nos adno-
temus quatuor, quid nos afficeret
in conspectu Dei oportet si velim
operibus operibus
justificari, nem-
pe legis justifi-
am numeris omnibus abso-
lutam, Calv. in
Rom. 5. 19. Sed

be accepted of him. (l) The Apostle saith what Christ's
righteousness is when he calleth it obedience. Observe what
we must bring into God's sight if we will be justified by works,
the righteousness of the Law complete. But because we bring th-
perfect obedience of the Law — because we have it not in us,
God freely giveth it. (m) No other righteousness is admitted
in Heaven then the entire observation of the Law. (n) The
righteousness of God which shall be approved at God's Tri-
bunall. (o) We live not before God without righteousness.
(p) At God's Tribunall no righteousness is so judged but per-
fect and absolute obedience of the Law. (q) We have need of
righteousness which will bear the examen and rigour of justice
entire and perfect.

quia offerimus perfectam Legis obedientiam — nam quia non habemus in nobis Dei nobis
gratuito donar, Calv. in Gal. 3. 6. (l) Non alia iustitia admittitur in Codice, quam incor-
gra Legis observatio, Calv. inst. I. 3. c. 14. p. 13. (m) Iustitiam Dei quae apud Dei
tribunal approbabitur, Calv. in Gal. 3. 9. (n) Non vivimus coram Deo sine iustitia,
Calv. in Rom. 1. 17. (o) Primam iustificationis nostræ causam non ad hominum judicium
referri, cum ad Dei tribunal ubi nulla iustitia constituit nisi perfecta absoluenda Legis
obedientia, Calv. ib. (p) At iustitiam quæ examen rigoremque judicii sustineat nobis
omnibus, integrum perfectamque necesse est, Aret. in Phil. 3. 9.

2. When as you tell us, p. 24. every *act* of judging and
esteeming a thing to be as it is, is not an imputing or accounting
it to another, which yet must be if it be rightly defined by the
rules of a definition.

The Answer is Mr. W. did not define it, he said not it
is, but it signifieth, which is not the manner of him that
defineth. Neither hath he a word of imputing it to another,
upon which what you tell us of the Sun and Moone,
&c. are built, they are Castles in the aire.

3. You say, when God imputes either my faith to me, or
Christ's righteousness (the one being the Scripture phrase, the
other Mr. Ws.) for my righteousness; be d—d not judge any
thing to be as indeed it is: for neither is my faith, nor the rig-
hteousness of Christ indeed my righteousness, but my faith in
that grace which God hath consecrated and ordained to bring me
into communion and fellowship of that righteousness that is of
that Justification, &c. which Christ by the merit of his life
and

and death hath purchased for us and for all those that believe in him. Therefore the phrase of imputing doth not signify an act of judgement, &c. by which a man judgeth a thing to be as it is.

1. The Scripture, and what hath beene spoken are directly against you, which shew Gods judgement according to truth. I oppose it to your bare negation.

2. For the Scripture as it mentioneth *imputation of faith*, which you confess is not righteousness, and truly as in a proper sense, so it saith *righteousness is imputed*, which is also against your assertion that it is not righteousness indeed, and elsewhere I shall make good to be Christ's; you shall not name a third.

3. The righteousness of Christ is mine, *he is my well-beloved, mine, he is the Lord my righteousness*. Sir, whether you will or no the Lord saith it, *this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our righteousness, Jer. 23. 6.*

4. Faith in a proper sense bringeth not into communion with the righteousness of Christ, as your selfe, though here you say it, elsewhere you deny it, & hereby you confound righteousness and justification as if they were one; if so, why doe you deny it elsewhere? if it be different, indeed it is an effect of righteousness imputed (so is justification) the matter, by imputation that by which? Why doe you confound them?

And here we may see what a goodly effect faith hath, and what a bringing into communion you meane, when as you deny communion with Christ's righteousness, but in the effect of it, to which after.

5. Faith in a relative sense setteth all at rights, it establisheth communion and fellowship with Christ, and his righteousness to justification; by this Christ's righteousness is our owne; the judgement of God is according to truth; when as the Lord imputeth it to righteousness, as the streams of Protestantism runneth.

6. When as you say, Mr. W. *inferris from Scripture, simply not naturally with his description of the word Imputing*. It is but a deniall, a deniall will answer it. To omit,

It is you, not Mr. W. that made it a description.

Viz. You say, some instances contradict that description of him according to his owne interpretation, of the phrase imputing, as that of Shimei, *Let not my Lord impute iniquity to me, but doth not* (saith Mr. W. truly but contradictingly to himselfe) *that David should not judge him iniquity to be none, and therefore it is against all reason he should say, still it so signifieth; and so for that of Job 33. 10. whence you deduce it, doth always so signifie.*

To which the answer is easie. The words *universally* and *awlays*, before, *still* and *afterwards* repeated now againe are not in Mr. W. they are your owne, as these, *definition and description*; devised to serve a turne. Where he saith it was so, he saith, *it is taken sometimes in other senses there named, when used by a trope, a metonymy of the cause for the effect, &c. a metaphor, &c.* see his instances; neither hath Mr. W. yet delivered you his application.

When as to shew the contrary you instance in Rom. 4. 8. & 2 Cor. 5. 19. *Where God is said not to impute sinne, the meaning is not that God doth not judge a believer to have sinne in him, and to judge as it is, but that God absolving men from guilt and punishment, and so imputing righteousness, that it is of a full different nature from judging it as indeed it is.*

For my part I know not, but when as God imputeth not sinne, he judgeth as it is, for there is neither guilt nor punishment properly so called to them that believe in Jesus Christ; which is therefore true, because they are justified by the righteousness of Christ, truly given them and applied by faith, by which as they are accounted righteous, and are so indeed.

When as you say Mr. W. owne tenet sheweth it, that God imputeth Christs righteousness for the righteousness we should have performed in our owne persons, which is not our owne personall righteousness. You misse-report it. Mr. Ws. words are, when God imputeth Christs righteousness to a believer, he counteth him perfectly righteous by that righteousness, and fable is indeed.

And

And because you judge Mr. W. for that passage (which a reason why imputing signifieth an act of judgement) Gods oughbis are just, and his judgements according to truth, Rom. 2. as if Gods imputing righteousness to him that is a sinner, and hath no righteousness, were an act of injustice in him, and contrary to truth.

Answ. I suppose he did it with good cause. Then when a man is accounted righteous for the righteousness of Christ imputed by God, applied by faith, as he is righteous indeed, so the judgement or account is true and righteous. Which not being a truth of faith imputed in a proper sense, if it should be imputed, doth therefore render Gods account not true nor just. So that directly you deny the one and other in this exception.

Neither is it a new practise of Mr. W. or his alone, but ordinary to be found in the learned.

Mr. Forbs, condemning imputation of faith in a proper iense, (which is your opinion) and calling it pernicious, and more pernicious then that of Papists, sheweth the same thus.

For when faith is not Relatively or instrumentally taken, in respect of Christ apprehended by it, it can never containe perfect righteousness, and so the Lord can never justify us by it; for the judgement of God is just and according to truth, Rom. 2. v. 2. 5. &c. They wittingly lay a ground themselves touching justification, wherein it is impossible that Gods judgement can be according to truth, seeing they make him to justify them, by that which in their owne confession is never answerable to the justice of God, p. 91. so he.

If God shou'd justify us.— or by faith or it is a worke or abit in us, God could never be scene to be just in justifying of us, &c. p. 92.

(q) God is just, and his judgement according to truth, faith is not the whole righteousness of the Law, but only a little part hereof.

But Gods judgement is according to truth, Rom. 2. 2. We know, &c. Will be who judgeth according unto truth, and who in judging cannot erre, who cannot deceive nor be deceived, ac-

(q) *Sybrandus*
to *Berinus*: De-
us est justus &
judicium ejus
secundum veri-
tatem; fides autem,
non est ratio
legis justitia,
sed tantum ex-
igua pars illius.
p. 30.

Sed Dei judi-
cium est secun-
dum veritatem,
Rom. 2. 2. sci-
ens, &c.

Num autem ille
qui judicat secun-
dum veri-
tatem, & qui in
judicando er-
rare nequit,
quique nec fal-
sere nec falli
potest, exigu-
am justitiae
portionem, e-
amque imper-
fectiam, & multis
peccatis con-
taminatam, ha-
bebit aut ha-
bere potest
pro perfecta
legis justitia?
p. 30.

own, or can be, a small pardon of faith imperfect and much defiled, for the perfidie righteousness of the Law.

(r) Quando Deus nosse putat iustos ex fide, veritas quæ huic reputacioni divina responderet, non est iustitia Christi formaliter inherens in nobis, sed iustitia Christi realiter participata & donata nobis ordinatione diuinæ. Si Deus

ex eo quod nobis imputat Christi iustitiam existimat nos inherenter iustos (quod neas dicit) errare Dei iudicium arque est in mente divina existimatio cui veritas rci non responderet, Rish. Dat. c. 28. p.

171.

(s) In alio iugur & fallitur Belarminus imputacionem justitiae Christi vocans nudam existimationem sive opinionem sine re, cum sit realis acceptatio peccatoris credens pro iusto in iudicio Dei, Patrum Castig. de just. p. 4. 85. Ut Cham. n. c. 5. Sess. 24. (t) Judicium Dei sicut est secundum ventram. Vere iusti facti sunt quicunque iustificantur a Deo, sed aliter per inherentem aliter per imputatam justitiam, p. 865. 866. (u) Esto, imputare non simpliciter existi maje, ut cum fallant intellegatur, & videatur hypocrita bonus qui ramen malus est: esto potius communium cum rei veritate, sed sua: nimis ut cuique Christiano, vere & realiter imputetur Christi iustitia, hanc nos veritatem imputationis absit ut oppugnemus, c. 13. Sess. 14. p. 20.

(v) When God doth account us just by faith, the truth which answereth this divine account, is not the righteousness of Christ formally inhering in us, but the righteousness of Christ really communicated and given us by divine ordination. If God should esteem us inherently just from that, that he imputeth unto us Christ's righteousness, his judgement should erre, and there should be in the minde of God an account in which the truth of the thing answereth not (which is wickedness fit for a man to speake) (x) Therefore Bellar. deceiveth and is deceived, calling this imputation of Christ's righteousness, a naked esteem or thought without the thing, seeing it is a reall acceptation of the believing sinner for a just man in Gods judgement.

Papists and Protestants agree that in justification Gods account is true and right. Bellar. and Becanus urge the judgement of God according to truth, to which Cham. (t) I confess that the judgement of God is according to truth, they are truly made just who are justified by God, but one way by inherency, another way by imputed righteousness. (u) Grant that to impute is not simply to suppose, as when the understanding is deceived, and an Hypocrite seemeth good; who is wicked. Let it rather be joyned with the truth of the thing, but its owne truth, that Christ's righteousness be truly and really imputed to every Christian; this imputation God forbid we should oppose,

Mr. Pembble to Becanus, urging Rom. 2. 2. faith. We embrace this rule, and the reason of it, acknowledging that where soever there is justification, there is justice, one way or other in the party justified. The question still stands in the manner, &c. justitiae Christi vocans nudam existimationem sive opinionem sine re, cum sit realis acceptatio peccatoris credens pro iusto in iudicio Dei, Patrum Castig. de just. p. 4. 85. Ut Cham. n. c. 5. Sess. 24. (t) Judicium Dei sicut est secundum ventram. Vere iusti facti sunt quicunque iustificantur a Deo, sed aliter per inherentem aliter per imputatam justitiam, p. 865. 866. (u) Esto, imputare non simpliciter existi maje, ut cum fallant intellegatur, & videatur hypocrita bonus qui ramen malus est: esto potius communium cum rei veritate, sed sua: nimis ut cuique Christiano, vere & realiter imputetur Christi iustitia, hanc nos veritatem imputationis absit ut oppugnemus, c. 13. Sess. 14. p. 20.

We

We affirme that it is by imputing unto him the perfect righteousness of Christ, accepting Christ's obedience for his.

We here take up the forenamed rule, laid downe by our adversaries. Whomsoever God pronounceth to be perfectly just, he must needs be made perfectly just, for Gods judgement is according to truth, p. 9. and elsewhere. God accounts shal onely for perfect righteousness of the Law which is so indeed and truely, but faith is not the perfect fulfilling of the Law: therefore God doth not account it for such.—

De justif. p. 13.

The major must be proved that God accounts not that for perfect justice, which is not perfect indeed; this appears, Rom. 2. 2. the judgements of God is according to truth. When there are any thing is not truly good and perfect, there God esteemeth it not truly good and perfect, ib. p. 37.

Gualter (you say) an orthodox Interpreter findeth grace and favour not strictness of judgement in the phrase of imputation. It teacheth us that God might indeed have dealt in strictnesse of judgement with us, and that we are indebted to his free grace that he dealeth not with us as we have deserved.

Who denieth but God might have dealt in strictnesse, required and exacted personall obedience, and have executed death on us for our sinne? and that it is mercy that God imputeth or giveth Christ's righteousness: the Apostle sheweth Christ and all his, gifts, and so effects of grace, and yet in that there is strict justice, and that is answered by the L. Christ our surety by his perfect righteousness, so that Gods righteousness is declared thereby. He is just in justifying, and so Orthodox interpreters, our owne, and others, as before. I may adde more.

The Law must be satisfied, or else we cannot be just, for the Lord doth allow no other righteousness but the very same which is described in the Law, which whosoever cannot attaine are pronounced guilty of eternall death; therefore if we will be righteous and saved, such a righteousness must be sought out, then which the Law cannot require a more absolute— and where shall we finde it? Our faith is but began and we must alwayes pray it may be increased in us— but righteousness must

Dr. Whitak. against Camp. Englished by M. Stoke, p. 224. &c p. 229, 230.
(w) Ad Dei tribunal, ubi nulla iustitia censetur nisi perfecta legis obedientia, Toss. in Rom. 2. 21,

(x) Nihil imperfectum aut inaneum potest dici iustitia Dei justificans, Id, ad Rom. p. 173. 7. Deum vere & summe justum in sponsorie, Berg. ad Rom. 4. 25.

(y) Nam ut alibi dixi nullos pro iustis approbat Deus, nisi quos prius vere ac summe (non in ipsis sed) in Christo suo, seu impurata

Christi iustitia justificaret, ut Pro. 17. 15. Beh. ad Rom. 4. 21. 5. (z) Junius. Sola Dei Patris misericordia iustificari peccatorem ita profitemur, ut Christum cum Officio Medicatoris causam proximan agnoscamus, qui sibi non natus sed nobis, Ies. 9. 5. ita offendit Patris sempernam iustitiam absolutissimam perfectionis Augustini misericordia hominibus reconciliavit, ut Deus iustitiae laudem in media misericordia non amitteret. Et si ut agens libertimum quos & quomodocunque velit iustificare potuit; obedientiam tamen filii necessariam fecit, tum natura ipsius qua infinite justus, tum parefacta in Legi voluntas que in Deo est recta & immota iustitiae regula (sic & Calvinus instit. 1. 4. e. 10. Sect. 1. 5. que insuper immutabilitate requirit satisfactionem pro peccato, & Legi impletionem per obedientiam, cum iustificare impium fine ulla iustitia βέλος μα εἰπει dixerit, Pro. 17. 15. facta est igitur translatio Legis, Heb. 7. 12. que non potuit vivificare, Gal. 3. 2. in Christum qui pro nobis sub Legi fatus, Gal. 4. 4. Legi omnimodo satisficeret, Thef. Theol. 35. p. 689.

be of that kind as that nothing at all may be added thereto.

The justice that frees us from the Law, neither increases nor grows, but is ever most perfect and absolute, that is, Christ bis obedience imputed to us by faith; — what that righteousness is see there. I will not make application. (w) At Gods tribunall nothing is accounted righteousness but perfect obedience of the Law. (x) Nothing imperfect or lame can be called the justifying righteousness of God. (y) God is truly and most just in the surety. God, & I have elsewhere said, doth approve none for just, but those whom first he maketh just truly, and in the highest degree, not in themselves, but Christs righteousness imputed. (z) We so profess a sinner to be justified by the onely mercy of God the Father that we acknowledge Christ with his office of a Mediator the next cause, who being borne for us, not himself, Jes. 9. 5. who by the ransome of most absolute perfection so reconciled the eternall justice of his offended Father to miserable men that God lost not the praise of justice in midst of mercy. Though as a most free agent he could iustifie whomsoever, and in what manner soever he would, yet both his Nature as he is infinitely just, and also his Will revealed in the Law, which in God is the eternall and immovable rule of justice: which moreover, in immutably requireth satisfaction for sinne, and fulfilling the Law by obedience, seeing to iustifie a wicked man without righteousness he hath called it abomination, there is therefore made a translation of the Law which could not give life on Christ, who being made for us under the Law might every way satisfie the Law for us.

(a) This righteousness was altogether to be fulfilled in us, therefore Christ putting on our flesh in our behalfe perfectly performed it. I came not, &c. Matth. 5. c^r 16. here it is easier for the Heavens to passe, this member appertineth to the application of Christs benefit to us. (b) Then shoulde it be vaine if not satisfied by us, or in our name by another, and that is satisfied by Christ who came not to dissolve, &c. and he did fulfill it in our flesh. (c) That very righteousness which the Law required that by its prescript we may be thought just and intire before God, for when as to forgiuenesse of sinnes and fulfilling the Law this third shall come, the perfect integrity of our nature, (all which we freely attaine in Christ apprehended by faith) let Satan doe what ever he can we are just before God, and that from that most absolute forme of the Law, therefore the Apostle said he came not to destroy the Law, but to establish it, Rom. 3. 21. (d) The righteousness of Jesus Christ by which we are justified before God is the most perfect obedience of the whole Law of God—the righteousness manifested in the Gospe^l, is the fulfilling of the Law made by Christ for us. (e) He excellently taketh away this scruple, when as out of the doctrine of the Law he establisheth the righteousness of the Law. (f) The Apostle well said we establish, for what doth Christs satisfaction but shew the threats of the Law not void when as Christ must indare them? and what is Christs righteousness else

solvere sed implere, Matth. 5. & can in carne nostra implevit ad Rom. 8. Beata in Rom. 8. v. 4. (c) *Sicut aqua*, illud ipsum quod requirit Lex ut ex ejus praecepto nulli & integrum coram Deo censetur: nam non ad peccatorum remissionem & implectionem justificat etiam hoc tertium, id est, perfecta natura nostrae integritas (quaz omnia gratis consequimur in Christo per hunc apprehenso) ut in omnes facies te convertatur Satan, justi sumus coram Deo, etiam ex illa absolutissima Legis formula quamobrem dixit Apostolus supra, c. 3. 31. se Legem non evocere sed stabilire. (d) Justitia Jesu Christi, per quam justificamus coram Deo est perfectissima totius Legis divinae obedientia—justitia in Evangelio parfecta est impletio Legis a Christo facta pro nobis, Polan. synt. l. 6. e. 36. p. 2947. per Evangelium Lex non aboleatur sed stabilitur, Rom. 3. 32. (e) *Catu*. hunc scrupulum optime discutit cum ex ipsa Legis doctrina stabilitate Legis justitiam. *Catu*. ad Rom. 10. v. 5. Stabilitus, merito hoc dixit Apostolus, nam Christi satisfactio quid aliud quam Legis misericordia ostendit, minime intitas esse, quum illas lucere Christianum oportemur? Sed & Christi justitia quid aliud est quam plena Legis praefatio? doctrina igitur ex fide quum non prius nos servet, quam justificat (id est, Christum nobis per imputationem applicet his omnibus virtutibus Legis ornatum), certe justitiam ex Legi non modo non evocet, sed potius stabilit in nobis, *Beg*. ad Rom. 3. ult.

(a) Hoc *Sicut aqua* protius sicut comple- dum etiam in nobis, ideoque Christus induens nostram carnem nostro nomine perle- ate praeflit le- gem, Matth. 5. non veni— & 16. hic facilius est celum— pertinet hoc membrum ad beneficium Chri- sti applicatio- nem ad nos, A- res in Rom. 8. 4.

(b) Nam cum deum redde- tur inanis si illi non satisficeret, vel per nos vel nostro nomine per aliud. acqui- id per Christum est satisfactum, qui non venit

8 *Toscan*. p. 26.

but a full performance of the Law. The doctrine therefore of faith seeing it doth not save us before it justifieth us, (this is, it appliceth Christ to us by imputation, adorned with all these vertues) surely it doth not only not overthrow the Law, but rather stablishest it in us.

Hitherto may I referre that eternall rule, Doe this and live, see Mr. Perkins argument. That which must be our righteousnesse before God must satisfie the justice of the Law, which faith, Doe these things and thou shalt live, but there is nothing that can satisfie that justice of the Law, but the righteousnesse and obedience of Christ, erga. See Abbot. p. 387. see Abot. p. 389. See Sybrand against Ber-tius, p. 140. & 144. and Mr. Pemb. p. 149.

By all which much may be noted by you if you will put the same to use, and that not onely mercy, but justice, exact satisfaction to the Law, are by Orthodox Writers established in free justification.

P. 27.

Mr. G.

Sect. 9. You goe on, and say (when as Mr. W. by righteousnesse saith it meant Evangelicall righteousnesse — even the perfect satisfaction and righteousnesse of Christ our Mediator and Surety, which be the Son of God, in mans nature performed to the Law.)

Riddle me, riddle me, &c. and that faish in any sense cannot be imputed for the righteousnesse of Christ.

1. If it be a Riddle, how can you solve it without explication? your arguing is a beating of the aire.

2. And in the rest you doe but triffe, that which is imputed is the righteousnesse of Christ, so Mr. W. truly; that is Evangelicall, Dan. 9.

3. That for the righteousnesse of Christ is not Mr. W.s. but your owne before answered, see his explication.

4. To that question, (though impertinent) whether any thing may properly be said to be truly and indeed the same with it selfe, and your reference of it to Mr. Walkers owne determination when his Logick returnes againe unto him.

I Answer, that I should thinke any thing may truly and properly be said to be the same with it selfe; neither doe I conceive any thing more truly and properly the same then the thing it selfe: other things may be like, are not the

the same. Every thing is every way the same with it selfe, identity is the sameness of a thing in my Logick. Your owne immediately preceding words may answer your question, which are, *surely there is nothing truly, really, and indeed the same with the satisfaction of Christ, but this satisfaction is selfe.*

So that what Mr. W. said is a truth, *that which God accounteth for righteousness is so indeed and maketh the person righteous indeed.*

So is faith (not in a proper sense) in a figurative sense apprehending the righteousness of Christ, righteousness indeed, and your inference, p. 28. but a formerly destroyed Remonstrant device.

When you comprehend not why Mr. W. should call the righteousness of Christ evangelicall righteousness, opposed to legall, and yet define a legall righteousness to be every mans fulfilling the Law in his owne person.

I take it no difficult thing, take it as performed by himselfe, it was his performance and legall; take him to be our surety, and consider him so performing the same, and it graciously given unto us by God in the Gospel, it is Evangelicall and rightly so called: Christ and all his benefits are Evangelicall, such is his everlasting righteousness, Dan. 9. (g) Neither are there places wanting amongst the Prophets of justifying righteousness, as,

You say legall righteousness of works cannot be inherens, because they are matters transient.

1. Though the works passe, the habit whence which also is strengthened by the worke, is inherent.

2. As infull acts passing, leave a staine and skarre as well as guilt on the soule, why may not acts of righteousness a contrary lustre?

3. The acts of righteousness of Christ passe not simply, they remaine with God to whom they were offered to the ends and uses for which they were performed as in the effects thereof.

4. Habits and acts in the Apostles disputes are infolded, neither doth he dispute against transient acts alone, but

(g) Nec defens:
apud Propheta
ta loca de ju
stitia justifican
te in Christi
Regno, ut Ios.
45. & 53. &
Dan. 9.
Tosian ad Rom.
P. 173.

3.

but inhering habits, the habit is *aliam primus*, neither is it the love of God, or faith in Christ that abideth not on him, conjoyning the soule and the object thereby.

4.

You demand why he should say, that to be inherent in every man which was never in any but Christ.

That may have a faire account. Legall righteousness was inherent in *Adam*, as well as in *Christ*. God made man *just*, what *Adam* had, the whole nature had in him, and so it was in every man. There is also a proportion to the Law in every Christian, *the Law of God is in his heart*, though it be imperfect and given by the Gospel.

5.

You know not why he should affirme Evangelicall righteousness to be a satisfaction performed to the Law. Why not? You grant it of the active obedience of Christ, but how the passive obedience of Christ which Mr. W. intendeth should be a satisfaction to the Law you apprehend not. You say the Law was satisfied in that perfect and intire obedience which Christ exhibited to it, and did not require of him (no more then it doth of any other man that shall fulfill it as he did) that he should be made a curse and die the death.

1. I answer, both make up full satisfaction in our behalfe, the Law said, *Doe this and live, and, Accursed is every man that abideth not in all the Commandments of the Lord to do them*: both are our debt: our surety must doe both in these names. God required doing, *he must fulfill all righteousness*; as God threatened death, Christ must suffer these things; *he was accursed for us, he died for us*.

2. The Law requireth full satisfaction of the surety as well as the principall, and punisheth the surety as well as the principall.

Luther ad Gal.
p. 160. 2.

But he setteth himselfe against the wrath of the Law, and taketh it away, and satisfieth the Law in his owne body by himselfe, I satisfie the Law for thee.

Mr. G.

But the Law doth not require that an innocent person should die, but the transgressor, so you, he should not, considering the innocent person per se, in himselfe, & qua, as a surety, it is not so: so considered he was and might be numbered with transgressours. He was made sinne for us, the ini-

quities

quities of us all were laid on him. They, sinnes were on his account, on him, before our sinnes; hence guilt, hence punishment; Satisfaction it was (you say) but not to the Law, it knowes no satisfaction, but to God, because hee required it.

Ausw. Whose Law was it, but Gods? you say God required it, Was it not in the Law? satisfie God requiring, and satisfie the Law: in it he requireth death on the transgression thereof.

Now that our *Surety* was by imputation a transgressor, hearken to *Divines*. Although *sinne* be taken for *Sacrifice* in the Hebrewes speech— yet the reason of the opposition requireth rather that Christ should be said to be made *sinne* for us, that is a sinner, not in himselfe, but by the guilt of all our sins imputed to him— where he citeth that of *Augustine*.

He was sinne, and we righteousnesse, not our owne, but of God, not in our selves, but in him, as he is made sinne, not bis owne, but ours, nor in himselfe, but in us; — We therefore are to the righteousnesse of God in him, as he was sinne in us, forsooth by imputation.

Christ is innocent concerning his owne person, and therefore he ought not to have beeene hanged upon a tree. But because according to the Law of Moses every Thiefe and Malefactor ought to be hanged, therefore Christ also according to the Law ought to be hanged, for he sustained the person of a sinner, and of a thiefe, not of one, but of all sinners and theives.— Therefore it behoved that he shoulde become a transgressor, and as Jes. the Prophet saith, to be reckoned and accounted amongst transgressours and trespassers. And this no doubt all the Prophets did foresee in spirit, that Christ shoulde become the greatest transgressor, murderer, adulterer, blasphemere, that ever was, or could be in all the world. For he being made a Sacrifice for the sinnes of the whole world, is not now an innocent person and without sinnes, is not now the Sonne of God borne of the Virgin Mary, but a sinner which bath and carrieth the sinne of Paul, who was a blasphemer, an oppressour, and a persecutor: of Peter which denied Christ: of David which was an adulterer, a murderer, and caused the Gentiles to blaspheme the name of the Lord. And

*Ber. ad 3 Cor.
§. ult.
Est peccatum
victima ex He-
breorum idio-
tismi, &c. Ta-
men ratio Anti-
thesis poscit ut
potius Christus
dicatur factus
esse peccatum
pro nobis, id est
peccator, non
in se sed ex
omnium pec-
catorum no-
strorum reatu
iphi imputa-
to.—*

*Ipsū peccatum
& nos justitia,
non nostra sed
Dei, non in no-
bis sed in ipso,
sicut ipsè pec-
catum non su-
um sed nostrū,
nec in se, sed in
nobis factus
est— sic ergo
sumus justitia
Dei in ipso ne
ille peccatum
in nobis nemis
ex imputati-
one.*

*Luther. ad Gal.
c. 3. 15. 13. p.
136. 137.
C. 53.*

briefely which hath and beareth all the sinnes of all men in him, body that he might make satisfaction for them with his own blood. — He verily is innocent, because he is the unspotted and undefiled Lambe of God : but because he beareth the sinnes of the world, his innocency is burthened with the sinnes and guilt of the whole world.

Whatsoever sinnes I and others and we all have done or shall do hereafter, they are Christ's owne sinnes as verily as if he himselfe had done them. — But what is it to beare? The Sophisters answer to be punished. Very well, but wherefore is Christ punished? Is it not because he hath sinne and beareth sinne? — So Lazarus. I passe others for the present.

Lastly, you call him a Dedalian Divine, and say he maketh no clever worke when he jumbles together the active and passive obedience of Christ and subjecteth them to the same consideration in respect to their performance to the Law.

Answe. Call him as you please, he hath not exceeded his mediocrity, here you prove it not. I finde no jumbling. What if he had put them together? they agree, and are his obedience. What was his taking our nature, what he did and suffered, his making himselfe of no reputation, but taking on him the forme of a servant, his being made under the Law, but his obedience, which lasted even untill death? and what but answer to Gods will and commandement on him as our Surety, what the Law spake to our Surety?

Lesse then the whole will not satisfie Gods justice, will not justifie, procure our freedome from sinne, and eternall life. I will try that with you when you please. So that yet he hath quitted himselfe.

Sick. No. But before you leave him you play the Crier. If any man or woman longs for contradictions, or other absurdities of the blood, I can yet releeve them out of this tract of Mr. W.

Surely that office doth not become you, you wanted an office when you tooke up that, the Ware you vent is no commodity, it is not appetible, adversaries onely desire them in such as they oppose for their owne advantage. O how corruption pleaseth it selfe with them! What a pre-

See Gerhard de
justif. p. 207.

6.
Mr. G.

x

ties

tious dish is it to please your admirers in this your opinion! Let us examine the matter.

P. 6. He affirmeth, and that truly (as you conceive) faith to be the first and radicall grace and vertue of renovation. I will agree with you both. Where is the contradiction or absurdity? you say, yet p. 5. in his definition of faith he supposeth the subject, or person in whom it is wrought to be regenerate, which doubtlesse is as much as to be renued.

P. 30.

I.

Answe.

Sir, are not faith and all graces wrought together, and at once? are they not together? is the subject then a believer, and not regenerate, and not renued? Is not faith that which is born of God, & the subject in that name regenerate and renued? What is regeneration or renovation but workes of God by his spirit enabling to beleeve, &c. and is it not necessary that in order of nature enabling to beleeve be before faith? This will never save a man or womans longing, nor tickle the Reader unless he be a beleever of you on those termes of Pythagoras his schollers, *Ipsé dixit*, he said it. Let us try another.

Answe.

Againe, p. 9. he affirmeth that God doth account and judge of all persons and things so as they are, and yet p. 11. granteth that God accounted Job his enemy, which he was not.

2.

Mr. G.

Mr. W. said not that God counted Job his enemy, but as Jobs speech: and then it is so asserted in an improper sense, and that distinct to the other which was first named, so that this is no contradiction: had he said the word is so taken, universally, always, still, (which you untruly charge him with before) it had beene somewhat to purpose, now it is neither contradiction nor absurdity. Mr. W. professedly laieth downe divers senses of the word, and that with a sometimes— as in that eleventh and tenth page. Why did you not make more contradictions as many as he did put different acceptations of the word?

Answe.

So p. 5. he defines faith, which is here said to be imputed for righteousness to be the supernaturall gift and grace of believing, and yet p. 8. that God imputeth a righteousness which neither consisteth in any worke or works, nor in any grace or vertues inherent, and p. 12. he saith, by imputing faith for righteousness

3.

Mr. G.

teousnesse is meant Gods setting of Christ's righteouſneſſe on the score, and putting it on the account of every beleever.

Anſw.

Faith questionlesſe is a supernaturall gift, but that it is imputed in a proper ſense, he ſaith it not, he blaneth you for the ſame, but ſtill in a relative ſense, as it apprehendeth and applieth the righteouſneſſe of Christ.

This righteouſneſſe imputed is neither any worke or works, grace or vertue inherent in us.

By imputation of Christ's righteouſneſſe is meant Gods ſetting it on the ſcore of, or putting it on the account of a beleever, he ſetteth it on his account, or really and truly giveth the ſame unto him. Here is not a contradiction to ſave a mans longing. It is well for him, not for your credit who beate up the Drum in Print and cry, *If any man or woman, who may ſay, Parturient monies*: let the Reader looke for itsg Enliſh in your ſelue.

Defining faith which the Apostle ſaith is imputed, he defines it a ſtrong faith, or faith in the biggeſt degree, ſo that a weake faith is not capable of Pauls imputation for righteouſneſſe.

It is true he ſaith, this faith of Abram was not weak, but a ſtrong faith and beliefe without ſtaggering, in that place. Doth he ſay the faith that is imputed muſt be ſtrong or not imputed? Where ſaith he, that a true faith, if not ſtrong and a weake faithed Christian muſt to Hell? No, it is another queſtion. Mr. W. holdeth faith juſtifying as a hand receiving, ſo it receiveth the treasure before it never ſo weakly it inricheth, ſo it receiveth Christ and his righteouſneſſe it juſtifieth ſtrong, and weake belongs to the more and leſſe, not to the nature of faith ſimply.

This also troubleth you, *that the ſpirit of God in working faith conſirms the heart with confidence and firme perſuaſion.* But why are you troubled? Is not the heart by nature weake, and doe not the workeſ of ſuch an one ſhew it? Ezek. 16. Doe not all graces ſtrengthen, and shall faith, the chiefeliſt, not conſirme?

Doth it trouble you that he ſaith, *the ſpirit of God working faith conſirms the heart with confidence?* it needeth not,

4.
P. 31.
Mr. G.

Anſw.

Mr. G.

Anſw.

not, for whether confidence be of the nature of that mixt habit faith (as I thinke) or the effect of faith, it must needs confirme the heart. It needeth not that he calleth a *perswasion*, it was so truly called before you were born, and if it did not perswade, how doth the soule assent?

And as for firmnesse, it being a part of the *inward and hidden man which is incorruptible*, a part of the *everlasting Kingdome of Christ*, it must be acknowledged firme; infused habits are so, all: they have more or lesse firmnesse in them.

Lastly, whereas Mr. W. saith that God sets Christs righteouenesse on the score, and puts it on the account of every beleever; you would know whether his meaning be *as God accounteth every beleever to have done and suffered the things which Christ did and suffered; or other tolerable constriction.*

Ianswer, his putting to account is such a valid donation of the same to a beleever, that he by faith in Christ as if himselfe had satisfied. We by him died, we by him fulfilled the Law. *He for them paid the ransome by his death, he for them fulfilled the Law in his life: so that now in him and by him every true Christian man may be called a fuller of the Law. Thus the Church of England in her Homily.*

To your ifs,

If God puts the righteousness of Christ it selfe upon a beleever's score, he puts the merit of Christ's righteousness upon his score also, for these are inseparabile: If he puts the merit of Christ's righteousness upon his score, he must put all the fruits and effects of his merit also, for these likewise are inseparabile as the other, and so God shall have accounted every beleever to have redeemed, justified, and saved the world. Mr. G.

I answer, God putteth the righteousness of Christ on the score of a beleever and the merit also, and so the effects of his merit are communicated. So that hereby man just, hath what to answer God requiring doing to life, and threatening death for sinnes, *Christ his righteousness and merits, and hence is he justified, saved, &c. And yet followeth not that God should account every beleever Saviour of the world. Your consequence is an absurd-*

Sive re imputaretur nobis iustitia Christi, profecto non minus iusti haberi censeret; deberemus quā ipse Christas, proinde redemptores & salvatores mundi, quod est absurdum. Nos autem absurdū dicimus. Tantum præcario, id est aliunde & in alio. Rursus hori non potest ut qui imputative iustus est, sit redemptor mundi & servator, sed tantum servatus & redemptus. *Cham.* de justif. c. 20 p. 23 24.

Eiusdem cause omnia effecta in unum individuum confundere.

Quis neget solis calorem applicatum arboribus, tunc causam generatorum fructuum omnium, neque tamen quisquam adeo insinuit, ut *Piro* applicaret generationem omnium fructuum, quia *Piro* vidit applicatum solis calorem. *Cauli* est, quia longe differunt calor & applicatio coloris. Calor consideratur in ipso sole unde manat in omnes arbores, sed applicatio attenditur omnibus arboribus, ut non in omnibus idem aliud communis, revera aliud aliud est cum calor applicatur *Piro*, & aliud cum *Pomo* & cum nuci & deinceps. Eadem ratio est iustitiae Christi, que communis in omnibus servandis in virtutem etiam, quandoquidem nullum est aliud nomen sub celo quo nos oportet salutem assequi, sed huius est *Pauli* iustitiae imputatio, sua *Petri*, *Iohanni*, *Jacobo*. Absurdissima ergo consequentia, imputari *Paulo* redimationem *Petri*, *Iohanni*, *Jacobi*, & aliorum. *Id. c. 21 p. 3.* In an answer to an objection of *Salmeron*.

Popish one, reasons are given by our learned Protestants answering Bellarmine, whose it is against imputed righteousness. If the righteousness of Christ (saith Bellarmine) shoulde be truly imputed unto us, truly we ought to be accounted and brought no less righteous then Christ himselfe, and therfore Redeemer and Saviour of the world, which is absurd. *Cham.* answering him, denieth the consequence in these words. *We* (Protestants) say it to be an absurd thing, and denieth in equisly just, for as much as be both it inherently, a se, from himselfe, and is per se iustus, just of himselfe, when as we inherently are unjust, and have our rightousnesse only by favour, that is elsewhere and in another: and addeth. Againe, it cannot be that he that is just by imputation shoulde be a Redeemer of the world, and Saviour, but only redeemed and saved.

Elsewhere he answereth this to be, to poure all the effect of the same cause into one individuals thing. Who would deny the beaste of the Sunne applied to trees to be the cause of all fruit brought forth? Yet none is so madde as to give unto the Pear-tree the bringing forth of all fruits, because he leaveth the beaste of the Sunne applied to the Pear-tree. The reason followeth. The reason is, beaste and application of beaste have a far difference.

Heate is considered in the Sunne it selfe, from whence it passeth to all the trees; but the application thereof is given to all the trees: so that it is not the same common all in all, indeed it is one all when as the beaste of the Sunne is applied to a Pear-tree, another whento an Apple-tree, and whento a Nut-tree, and so for the rest. This he applieth. There is the same reason of the righteousness of Christ which is common to all that shall be saved to eternall life, for as much as there is no other name under Heaven in whom we ought to attaine salvation.

tion. But Paul had his imputation of righteousness, Peter did, and so John and James. It is therefore a most absurd consequence, that the redemption of Peter, John, James, and the rest, should be imputed unto Paul. Doctor Ames answering the same objection, laileth downe the Protestants contention.

1. Christ's righteousness to be so farre imputed unto us, that we by the vertue thereof should be accounted so just before God, as if we our selves bid that by which we are accounted righteous before the Lord.

2. The righteousness of Christ to be accounted to particular believers according to their particular necessity, not according to all the worth of it, as a precious stone of great price, which is given for the redeeming of divers Captives, is applied to particulars, not according to the universall worth, but according to the necessity of every Captive: mention therfore of the world is absurdly made in particular application.

3. The righteousness of Christ is not imputed unto us as causes, but only as Subjects thereof. Bellarmine therefore most unfeitly inferreth us to be capable of the name of Redeemers or Saviours, because we be redeemed and saved.

Our late Learned Bishop of Salisbury answereth the same argument, and to that part faith, *It is a ridiculous inference, for he is a Redeemer and a Saviour, not who receiveth redemption and salvation, another's worke imputed unto him; but who performeth redemption and salvation by his owne effectuall worke.* *Sicut redempti & salvati recte firmamur, sed redemptores a nemine qui mentis compos est appellatur. Postremo, & illud perpendendum, Christi iustitiam non imputari huic auctori credenti, secundum totam latitudinem efficacia sua, sed prout unusquisque illa opus habet. Non igitur Petro imputari ut generale premium redempcionis pro omnibus sed ut premium qua illius anima in particulari redimatur, cuiusque merito ille in particulari ad vitam glorie evchatur. Ex tali autem imputatione hujus iustitiae neque colligi potest nos esse que justos esse ac Christianum, neque omnino redemptores dicendos.* Dr. Dav. de justitie hab. c. 24, ad arg. sextum p. 331.

Ridicula illationem redemptor & salvator est non qui accipit redempcionem & salutem alterius operari sibi imputata: sed qui præstatur alteri redempcionem & salutem sua opera efficaci. Ab imputatione igitur hujus iustitiae

- Therefore

Therefore we are rightly affirmed redeemed, and saved, from the imputation of this righteousness, but we are called Redeemers by none that are in their right wits. Last of all, that also is to be considered, Christ's righteousness cannot be imputed to this or that believer, according to the whole latitude of its efficacie, but at every one bath need of it. It is not therefore imputed to Peter the generall price of redemption for all, but at the price by which a soule in particular is redeemed, and by whose merit be in particular is exalted to eternall life. But from such an imputation of this righteousness, it can neither be gathered that we are equally as just as Christ, nor at all to be called Redeemers.

If we looke on the truth of the righteousness which is imputed to us, we are accounted no lesse just before God then Christ, and yet we are not Redeemers. See the place.

Thus what you oppose to imputed righteousnesse at absurdity is opposed by Papists, and the inference shewed to be most absurd by the learned Protestants against them, to their Barre you stand and must make an answer. In a word, though every member hath communion with the head Christ, and partaketh for, and according to his need, as a member of a naturall body from the naturall head, yet hath he not Christ's merits to give to others, more then a member in the body, suppose the finger, hath life from the head and heart, to give to the feete and toes: and this you may take as Master Walkers owne answer.

Sel. 13. Come we now to the confirmation of the exposition Mr. W. gave, neglecting what you fasten on him before sufficiently cleared; and many vaine lines together, p. 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38. for, debent neg'igi, they ought to be neglected.

Mr. Walker judging the Apostle the best interpreter of himselfe, argueth for a tropicall sense, from Rom. 2.26. &c. where the word λογισθαι, to be accounted or imputed, is first used. If the Uncircumcision keepe the righteousnesse of the Law, shall not his Uncircumcision be accounted for Circumcision? from whence he gathereth that as by a double trope (at large explicated) Uncircumcision taking in with it and comprehending the righteousnesse of the Law shall be accounted

counted and accepted for the state of an holy and righteous man, one circumcised in heart, though he be uncircumcised in a Gentile outward estate,

So by *Abrahams* believing by a *Metalepsis* or double trope the *Apostle* doth understand *Abrahams* standing in the state of a true believer united by one spirit to *God* in *Christ*, and having communion of his satisfaction and righteousness, faith comprehending the perfect righteousness and full satisfaction of *Christ* to be accounted to him given to him for righteousness, or that which makes him righteous.

To this. (*Passing what you say this Scripture would doe if managed to throw downe his interpretation, and the slight summe of all granted, being but a cipher in your account, apparently such (as you say) because you doe but say both.*)

Mr. G.

I. By way of answer you demand, *What if he could prove that here were trope upon trope, and mountaines of metonymies? Doth this prove a necessity either of the same kinde of tropes or figures in other Scriptures, which yet is the strength of the argument?*

Mr. G.

Answe. Mr. *Walkers* intent is not to prove a necessity by this argument, but that the *Apostle* (the best expounder of himselfe) thus useth the phrase in another place in the same Epistle as is here interpreted, that it is not therefore so strange, *bysib*, and *uncombin* an expression, and figure of speech, and not to be found in all his writings besides, as you charge the figurative interpretation to be. See Mr. *W.* book p. 352. *Tropicall* speeches are usuall, and that is a manifest place suting with this.

And this may suffice for this argument, your answer unto it, the rest p. 34, 35, 36, 37. are but impertinencies, which I may neglect without giving you advantage or the least damage to Mr. *W.* cause: there is nothing unsound but might well be maintained against your many words.

Sect. 12. Mr. *Walkers* first argument is taken from the fourth verse, and is framed by you thus. *That thing which is counted for righteousness bringeth with it a reward to the believer, not of debt, but grace, viz. eternall life. But it is the*

satisfaction and righteousnesse of Christ, not faith in a proper sense, that bringeth this reward, eternall life with it; therfore it is the righteousnesse and satisfaction, and not faith that is imputed for righteousnesse.

Mr. G.

To the proposition you answer by distinction. At this may be said to bring with it a reward either of voluntary or free covenant or compact, or by way of merit and just retribution. In the former sense the proposition is granted for truth because faith brings with it a reward in this sense, as well as the satisfaction of Christ doth in the other.

If he meaneth by way of merit, the proposition is false, so the which is imputed doth not necessarily bring with it a reward in such termes, or in such a way. God in a gracious and free covenant hath promised the same (if not greater) reward to them that shall beleieve in Jesus Christ, which he hath promised to those that shall keepe the whole Law.

Answe. For answer. First, for your distinction of free covenant, and merit in this our busynesse, I suppose things in it are divided and set in opposition which God hath joyned together. For the merit of Christ is the confirmation of the free covenant. God is so, by Jesus Christ the just, and the covenant is in his bloud, heand his righteousnesse are the promise of God. What is offered and tendered in all ordinances for eternall life to faith, or receiving of him, as *Act 10.43.* by beleeving and receiving him he is made the *Lord my righteousnesse*, righteousnesse to me, to which the Lord performeth life. The Apostle sheweth them iubordinate, when as he saith *we are justified freely by grace through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth a propitiation through faith in his bloud, Rom. 4.24.* Your distinction is true of humane merits, not the merit of Christ, the Surety of the covenant.

2. I affirme, Mr. Walker intendeth such a gracious way of merit, and so doth the Apostle disputing against our works, this doth in this way infallibly bring with it the reward, eternall life; which faith in a proper sense, not taking in the righteousnesse and merit of Christ, doth not, cannot more then mans workes.

3. Then

3. There is nothing else can doe it saith Mr. W. It is a gracious way satisfying justice, the Apostle saith, *the spirit of life*, that is, the soule liveth eternally, because of righteousness, the righteousness of Christ imputed, Rom. 8. 10. where by righteousness the Apostle meaneth *this same imputed righteousness which we assert against Papists*.

4. Hence the assumption is sound, for howsoever faith in a relative sense and Christ's righteousness imputed, (faith being but the hand, the applying instrument, Christ's righteousness applied that alone which justifieth as the meritorious and formall cause) have a sweet and harmonious agreement in our justification. It is not so when as faith is taken in a proper sense, though it be faith in Christ. Whence your selfe, *Arminius*, and *Socinus*, asserting the imputation of faith, adde, and *not Christ's righteousness imputed*, and so put them in opposition in the matter of justification.

Hanc ipsam
quam nos asse-
tumus iustitiam
imputatam.
Cham. de just.
c 2. Sect. 59.

When as you lay downe the manner of either, viz. that Christ justifieth by way of merit, satisfaciou, and atonement making with God for sinne. Here is a truth, but not all, for there must be imputation of it, reall donation also of Gods part to make us righteous, and faith must concur not in a proper sense as accepted for the righteousness of the Law in it selfe (as you say) but (as you say also) *it bringeth us into communion of Christ's perfect righteousness*, by which faith, (as by an hand receiving riches, riches doe make rich the receiver) receiving the righteousness of Christ that maketh righteous; faith is as the hand, the righteousness that which as riches corporall that way, do make us thus spiritually rich, that is, righteous in the sight of God. Faith doth it relatively or by a figure not in a proper sense which you stand for: thus much you say, also.

5. When as you say, *the Lord hath promised the same reward, or a greater to those that shall believe in Jesus Christ, then that which he hath promised to those that keepe his whole Law*, disputing against the relative sense for faith in a proper sense. What dosh result but the *Servetian*, *Socinian*, and *Armini-*

Fides habetur
pro omni legis
justitia quam
nos prestat
tenebantur.
See Sybrand, p.
9. ad Bert.

an tenet, delivered also by Bertius, faith is accounted for the whole righteousness of the Law which we are bound to performe, which also they attribute to gratuise acceptation.

Sect. 13. Mr. Wrs. third argument is taken from the 6. and 11. v. That the thing imputed by God is properly righteousnesse, such as being imputed brings forgivenesse of iniquity and covers sinnes, and so maketh the beleever blessed. Now there is no righteousnesse to be found amongst all mankinde but Christis perfect righteousnesse and satisfaction and that is a perfect propitiation for all sins, therfore it is the righteousnesse which is imputed for justification.

Of this argument you say it is built cleane besides the foundation it claimeth, and when you prove what you say, you shall have an answer. But to what you answer.

1. You say, *That the conclusion Christis righteousnesse must needs be that which is imputed for righteousnesse in a proper sense, is diametrically opposite unto himselfe in severall examined passages, particularly to that which saith faith comprehending in it the righteousnesse of Christ is imputed for righteousnesse to him, which differ greatly.*

1. Though faith and Christis righteousnesse differ, and are opposed diametrically in your sense and acceptation they are subordinate in Mr. Walkers.

2. And when faith is said to be imputed taking in the the righteousnesse of Christ; You know Mr. Walker saith faith is imputed in an improper sense, and that Christis righteousnesse is that which is imputed in a proper sense; that is it wch alone properly imputed maketh us righteous.

2. You blame his understanding the Apostles phrase of imputing righteousnesse, v. 6. supposing a proper pre-existent righteousnesse for the matter of such imputation which is one of his mistakes.

I answer, Mr. Walkers understanding had beene blameworthy, had he supposed otherwise; for a proper perfect righteousnesse is necessary to make oneso righteous.

Gods people are holy, unreprovable, unblamable in Gods sight, perfectly just, can that be without righteousnesse?

Mr. Bradshaw sheweth, that, the proper matter of Justification is justice or innocency not caused or produced by the act of Justifica-

Answ.

Justification, but existing some way or other before, for a person is not therefore just because he is justified, but he is therefore justified because he is just. The justice of the party justified, being the cause of his justification, and not his justification the cause of his justice.

Mr. Bradfb.
treat. justif. c.2.
Sect. 10.

Papist and Protestant agree in this, the one putting inherent righteousness the formall cause, which being imperfect, is truly rejected by us, and so faith in a proper sense. The other put the perfect righteousness of Jesus Christ.

It is certaine, saith Mr. Wotton, that the forme of Justification consisteth in righteousness, because we are justified or constituted just by righteousness given to us from God, which he sheweth out of Papists and Protestants.

The Apostle saith, *by the obedience of Christ we shall be constituted righteous*. It is you and Arminius that talke of making just without any justice at all.

That Mr. W. is mistaken you prove.

1. Because it is not said *# digneus eris, but without the article, dignus eris, which intimateth he speaketh not here of any particular or speciaall righteousness fixed in any subject as the righteousness of Christ is.*

Here you grant righteousness; whether it be fixed in a subject or not, you seeme so at least.

And when as you tell us of righteousness not in a subject, you tell us of an accident without a subject; where was your Logique? There is no righteousness whether it be generall or particular, but it is in some subject; so is the inherent righteousness, of which Papists in their opinion, so faith in that opinion, and so the righteousness of Christ.

To your second, *Even the righteousness of Christ must be imputed for the righteousness of Christ*. We answered before. It is but a borrowed jingle.

Thirdly, you answer, *The righteousness here imputed is without works, which Christs is not; works are the essence thereof.*

To which you know is answered, the works which are excluded are not works simply, and namely of Christ, but our own works.

Cum justifica-
tionem sine ju-
stitia constitu-
ere, sit insom-
nium sine som-
no cogitare
Gerb. de justif.

p. 135.
Justificationis
formam justitia
constare certu-
est, quoniam
justificamus si-
cive justi consti-
tuimur. per ju-
stitiam nobis a
Deo donatam.
Wotton, de re-
concil. par. 1.
l. 2. c. 2. p. 34.

Against this you argue, or say, such a distinction as this is, is without any foundation in this or in any other Scripture.

But not truly, for as the Scripture denieth Justification by the workes of the Law, so it establisheth Justification by the righteousnesse and obedience of Christ, Rom. 5. 17, 18, 19, by this is there a perfect supply of what was not in us, but should have beene to life, as the Apostle, Rom. 8. 4. and Rom. 10. 4. and when as the Apostle objecteth, *Doe we make the Law of God wide throughb faith?* He answereth, *God forbid, and yea we establish the Law.* So doth faith applying the righteousnesse of Christ that establisheth the Law.

Homil. Salv. p. 14. The Church of England saw this, you might have learned it there. *Whereas it lay not in us to doe, (that was impossible before) be provided a ransome for us, that was the most precious body and bloud of his owne most deare and best beloved Sonne Jesus Christ, who besides this ransome fulfilled the Law for us perfectly: and from the third of the Rom. 8. & 10. our Church, there must be on Christs part to justification, justice, that is the satisfaction of Gods justice, or the price of our redemption by the offering of his body, and shedding of his bloud with fulfilling of the Law perfectly.*

lvi. So the grace of God doth not shun out the justice of God in our Justification, but surely shuntest out the justice of man, that is to say the justice of our workes, as to be merits deserving our justification.

Whereras all the world was not able of their selves to pay any part towards their ransome, it pleased our heavenly Father of his infinite mercy, without any our desert or deserving to prepare for us the most precious jewels of Christs body and bloud, whereby our ransome might be fully paid, the Law fulfilled and his justice fully satisfied. So that Christ is now the righteousnesse of all them that truly doe believe in him, he for them paid the ransome by his death, he for them fulfilled the Law in his life, so that now in him and by him every true Christian man may be called a fulfiller of the Law, for as much as that which our infirmity lacked, Christs justice hath supplied: Here is the explication of our article of Justification, and thus in the

Art. of Ireland, Art. 35. Other Authors are needless, these enough.

And hence may you perceive the necessity of the distinction; the Law and justice of God are hereby satisfied, which cannot be where works are simply excluded, that it is not vain and frivolous, our justification else is impossible.

Sect. 14. You argue that if the righteousnesse God is here said to impute, be the righteousnesse of Christ, then the description thereof, v. 7. & 8. is impertinent and improper, being laid downe, in imparting sinnes, covering sinnes, not imputing sinnes; the imputing of Christ's righteousnesse in the sense pretended is much more then forgivenesse of iniquity or not imputing sinne.

For answer. You must prove that forgivenesse of sinnes, &c. are the description of that righteousnesse imputed. It is but begged.

Imputation of righteousnesse is not the same with forgivenesse of sinnes. It is more, it is the cause of remission of sinnes, this an effect of righteousnesse imputed. This righteousnesse imputed bringeth forgivenesse with it, covers sinne, making the beleever in that respect blessed.

Remission of sinnes is caused by perfect righteousnesse imputed.

Mr. Wotton confesseth Justification an effect of righteousnesse, and Justification is indeed the proper and the true effect of righteousnesse wh. is way soever, that righteousnesse is imputed or communicated unto us.

Yea, remission of sinnes is an effect of Justification. Pardon is neither the whole nor any essentiall part of Justification, but only a contingent effect of it.

Finally you say, Gods imputing righteousnesse (in this place) is meant onely his justifying of men, or (as Mr. W. p. 10.) a dealing with men according as if they were righteous.

It is so, not in deed, but in the effect thereof: indeed imputation of righteousnesse is the cause, justification the effect thereof. Mr. W. faith not so, but that it is Gods accounting them righteous, and dealing with them accordingly.

4.

See Mr. Gatak.
Se contra Lu-
cium. p. 9. 1. p.
10. 1, 11, 21, 45
82. 98. 3. 64. 4.
Imo vero hoc
nondum à re
demonstratum
est, nec vero
unquam de-
monstrabitur,
par. 1. Sect. 8.
n. 12 p. 45. He
to Piscator.

Remissio pec-
catorum fit per
justitiam impu-
tatarum perfectā.

So Pareus. Ca-
stig. Bell. de
justif. p. 389.

Estque justifi-
catio revera
proprius & ve-
rus justitiae ef-
fectus, quoquo
modo ca justitiae
imputati si-
ve communi-
cari nobis in-
telligatur. p. 34
M. Bradf. p. 34.

To

See Pareus on
Rom. 4. 7. cited
elsewhere.

To that which followeth I may say, that, to impute righteousness is not the description of the act of abolition. It is an effect following on that, upon imputation of righteousness, not imputation of sinne followeth and no condemnation.

The same may be said to what is alledged out of the 11. vers. being justified, and righteousness imputed differ as the cause and the effect. *Imputation goeth before remission as a cause, and is necessarily pre-required.*

When as you say, being justified, cannot be without righteousness, either it is that which is inherent or imputed; not inherent, it is against the scope of the Apostle denying Justification by workes or habits whence they flow, and therefore not by faith, which is a part of inherent righteousness considered in a proper sense: therefore it must be by the righteousness of Christ; the righteousness which is by faith as the word calleth it.

From thence *Toscanus* giveth to us as Saint Pauls Theorem. Whence Paul saith donne that Theorem. Our righteousness not to be morall vertue or habitnall justice, as with the *Pbarises* the *Pontificians* would have it; but the imputation of the righteousness of Christ.

To that you beleeve, that if the best interpreters be consulted, not one will be found to contradict this interpretation of the phrase imputing to righteousness in this place, or by righteousness to understand the righteousness of Christ.

I hope your infidelity is not invincible, many things are in Interpreters which you doe not looke after.

Though Gods imputing righteousness justifieth; yet these differ as cause and effect as hath beeene shewed. And

When you say they understand not the righteousness of Christ. It is apparently against all Protestant writers, who teach the righteousness of Christ to be that which is imputed, and not faith in a proper sense, as also from this that they denying the proper sense, are for the relative and improper sense.

Beza to those words, to righteousness. For this is the end and scope of faith, that we should be justified by the imputation of

Causalitate imputatio praecedit remissionem, & necessario præ-requiritur. Polan. in Daniel. p. 324.

Unde extruit Paulus istud theorema, justitiam nostram non esse virtutem moralem aut habitualem justitiam, sicut cum Pharis et Pontificii volunt, sed imputationem justitie Christi. *Toscanus ad Rom. c. 4. p. 4.*

Ad Rom. 4. 3.
Ad justitiam.
Hic enim finis & scopus fidei ut imputatione justitie Christi percam apprehensi justitiae mut. ib.

the righteousness of Christ apprehended by it.

Who also addeth, But there is in the words an Hypallage, (a figure so called) for God is properly said to impute righteousness by faith at the Apostle by and by speaketh, vers. 6. &c. Quid autem intelligitur justitiae nomine, expositum adversus Sophistas; supra, 1. 17. & c. 3. 20.

31. But what is understood by the word righteousness, we have expounded before, against the Sophisters; above, cap. I. v. 17. & c. 3. 20.

When Bellarmine said, our Adversarius (Protestants) could never bisherto finde a place in the Scriptures or Fathers, where it is read that Christ's righteousness is imputed to us for righteousness, or that we be just by the imputed obedience of Christ, therefore this is false. Paresus answерeth.

The Antecedent is false, for it is expressly read, To him that believeth, his faith is imputed; and by and by, Blessed is he to whom God imputeth righteousness without works. That these are equipollent to the Apostle, is so evident that it cannot be denied: therefore they are equivalent, faith to be imputed to righteousness, and righteousness to be imputed without works. It is therefore evidently sound, righteousness, by which we believers are justified, to be imputed unto us from God, or to be imputed righteousness. Whose this righteousness is, the same Apostle expoundeth in the following chap. 5. 19. Now our Adversarius (Bellarmine) bath where we have read it, from thence thus, (we reason) Righteousness by which believers are justified, is imputed unto us from God, Rom. 4. 5, 6. the righteousness by which we believers are justified, is the righteousness or obedience of Christ, Rom. 5. 19. therefore the righteousness or obedience of Christ is imputed to us of God.

Sed est in verbis Hypallage, nam pro prie dicitur Deus imputare justitiam per fidem,

ut mox loquitur Apostolus, v. 6. & 11. Quid autem intelligitur justitiae nomine, expositum adversus Sophistas; supra, 1. 17.

& c. 3. 20.

Nullam in Scripturis aut Patribus locum hastenus invente poterunt adversarii, ubi legeretur Christi justitiam nobis imputari ad justitiam, vel nos justos esse per imputatam nobis Christi obedientiam, ego hoc falso est.

Antecedens est falso, legitar enim expresso, Credenti fides sua imputatur; & mox, Beatus cui Deus imputat justitiam absque operibus. Hec Apostolo esse equipollentia tam est evidens ut negari non possit; prouinde equipollentia sunt, adem imputari ad justitiam, & justitiam imputari absque operibus. Evidenter igitur habetur justitiam qua credentes justificamus nobis a Deo imputari, seu esse justitiam nobis imputaram. Cujus vero est haec justitia, id exponit idem Apostolus, c. frequente, 5. 19 — Habet Adversarius ubi legerimus: inde eniā sic, Justitia qua credentes justificamus nobis imputatur a Deo, Rom. 4. 5, 6. Justitia qua credentes justificamus est justitia seu obedientia Christi, Rom. 5. 19. igitur justitia seu obedientia Christi, nobis a Deo imputatur. Coslig. p. 457.

Nec refert quod Apostolus non dixit beatius cui Deus imputat Christi iustitiam: sed absolute, cui Deus imputat iustitiam: iustitia enim imputata recte dicitur iustitia Christi, quia Christus sua obedientia eam nobis acquisivit.— imo Christi iustitia expresse vocatur, Rom. 5. 18, 19. *Patrum Castig. ib. p. 388.*

Ad Rom. 4. 3, 5; p. 484. because Christ acquired it by his obedience— I, it is expressly called the righteousness of Christ, Rom. 5. 18, 19. The same Parens, iustitia imputata Christi iustitia dicitur, imputed righteousness is called Christ's righteousness.

Legimus passim apud Paulum justos nos fieri & justificari, per Christum, per Christi mortem, sanguinem, redemptionem obedienciam & iustitiam, & illam iustitiam imputari nobis a Deo absque operibus. *Bellar. Enerv. 10. 4. p. 157.*

Justificationem Apostolus describit, non sola remissione peccatorum, sed etiam iustitiam Christi imputatione, ut apparet ex c. 4. ad Rem. v. 6. & 7. *Gerhard. de just. Sess. 6. 3.*

The same learned man, Neither is anything that the Apostle said not, be in happy to whom God imputeth the righteousness of Christ, but absolutely, to whom God imputeth righteousness, for imputed righteousness is rightly called the righteousness of Christ, be-

Our Ames. We reade every where in Paul, that we are made just and justified by Christ, by Christ's death, blood, redemption, obedience, and righteousness, and that righteousness to be imputed to us of God without works.

To the same purpose, see Sybran. declar. Vorst. p. 94.

I will end this with that learned Doctor of our Church, Whitaker a. Docttor Whitaker, to Durens, saying, our Doctrine of imputative righteousness to be against the word.

Thus you speake like a Jesuite, but what doth the Scripture more celebrate? Rom. 4. 3, 4, 5, 6. a cleare text for it, so that there being more then one such Interpreters, you may beleeve it.

When Musculus saith, the righteousness of God which is freely imputed, is not to impute sinne; He intendeth not that they be formally one and the same, but in the effect, this as an effect followeth that; so doth he call remission of sinnes our righteousness, as Mr. W. citeth him, p. 348. the book is not in mine hands.

Sess. 15. Mr. Walkers fourth argument runnes thus, summed up by it selfe. Whatsoever is here said to be imputed, is, that which serves for righteousness to justification. Christ's righteousness is that which serves for righteousness to justification, Rom. 5. 19. Rom. 8. 4. Rom. 10. 4. Ergo,

Iustitia. Dei quia gratis imputatur est non imputari peccatum.

it is that which under the name of faith is said to be imputed. You answer, This was for substance before propounded and answered. To which I, if so, repetition will be vaine on both sides. Let it goe.

You adde, Though nothing but the righteousness or satisfaction of Christ will serve meritoriously unto justification. Several things doe ministerially, the Word, the Minister, and so faith in Christ, &c.

Mr. Wr. is not about instrumentals in this argument, but that, which imputed, justifieth, which is (faith he) by the Scriptures the righteousness of Christ.

When as you grant nothing meritoriously serving but the righteousness of Christ, though we take it in part, yet we must have more, it must be also a formall cause, or all one with it; Doctor Davenant may teach you to speak out.

Truely in Justification such a formall cause is to be put, which withall may be the meritorious cause: for unless it containe that worth in it selfe, for which a man may be rightly accounted justified, it will never be the formall cause by which a man stands justified in the sight of God.

Revera in justificatione, talis causa formalis ponenda est que simul & meritoria esse possit nisi enim continet illam dignitatem in se, proper quam homo rite justificatus reputetur nunquam erit formalis causa per quam justificatus existit in conspectu Dei. De infinit. habit. el. 22. p. 312.

Grant then this meritorious cause imputed to justifie, it satisfieth Mr. Walker, and serveth the turne, else noe.

He confesseth and contendeth faith an instrument by which we have fellowship with that righteousness to justification, faith being as the hand receiving and applying the same, by which righteousness it is that we are justified, and not faith in a proper sense, it not being the hand that properly maketh rich, but what is received by it: which you cannot indare (with the Remonstrants) though a common Protestant expression in this controversie against the Romaniſt denying also the proper sense of faith.

To omit that faith is not the righteousness of Christ urged, Rom. 5. 19. nor righteousness in which a man can stand before God, be made just, said to be holy and unapproachable, and unblamable in Gods sight, perfected for ever, as the

man is that is justified, or otherwise then taken in a Relative sense to the object thereof.

S. & 16. Mr. W's. fifth argument is, *That this exposition is warranted by other places of Scripture*, which he proveth out of Psb. 106. as the only place: see the place.

This you bring on the stage, and say it bath such a visor on the face of it, that a man cannot tell of what shape it is, only it is evident from his owne words, that here be starts, & rather conjures up a new conclusion as farre differing from what he laboured to conclude, as the East is from the West.

Good Sir, if (by reason of the visor on the face of it) a man cannot tell of what shape it is, how is the latter so evident? may not a man question you for the latter, professing the former, that a man cannot tell of what shape it is; or are you more? this, and what followeth such a profession must be accounted roving.

But how prove you such a differing new conclusion? he writes (say you) that the imputing or accounting of a thing for righteousness is no more but declaring a man thereby to be righteous, and giving him the testimony of righteousness.

Thus you deliver him. I finde it not so in his Printed Copy, and even there his conclusion is what was to be concluded, therefore this is to be judged the best exposition.

Besides what he speaketh of declaring is added for farther explication of what God did, when as he imputed righteousness to Phineas as himselfe. God upon this all gave him testimony and declared and judged him to be a righteous man truly justified. But by this reasoning say you, he seemeth to imply that a man is not constituted or made righteous, or truly and really justified by the imputation of Christ's righteousness or satisfaction it selfe unto him, but onely that he is declared to be such, &c.

There is no such implication. That is necessarily implied by Gods declaration, for God cannot give testimony contrary to what a man is indeed, God cannot ly, his judgement is according to truth, and so his testimony; the visor troubleth you. You proceed.

Neither doth that Scripture prove that heterogeneall conclusion,

it doth not import any testimony from God of his personall righteousness or justified estate before God, but only the righteousness of the particular act.

Surely that act did shew him (as Mr. Wr.) united to Christ, and a partaker of righteousness by faith, on which God gave him testimony.

And I suppose a righteous act importeth personall righteousness inherent, which are inseparable from righteousness imputed, by which righteousness imputed, that which is inherent, the acts thereof and person are justified. From this, not inherent righteousness or acts thereof, it is that man is perfectly just and so denominated. And thus Mr. Wr. passeth to the Confutation of the false exposition made by Socinus and other Heretiques his disciples, &c.

Here you charge Mr. Wr. to be an Heretique maker, which Mr. Wr. may easily discharge with repetition of the same words, and resolve his making Heretiques into Mr. John Goodwin as the maker of an Heretique maker, &c. The truth is, if the interpretation be heretically (as some have said before Mr. W. as before) not Mr. Wr. but Mr. John Goodwin, &c. have made themselves such by embracing and broaching the same with those Heretiques: and though Mr. Wotton be dead, his opinion liveth in his works and such as follow him. His fall is the greater in this by how much the more he is exalted as a *Cedar in Lebanon*. It is a truth of him and all the Prinees of his opinion. That hath beene discussed already, and we have seene Mr. Wr. farre from affirming the same, detesting it, constantly denying you his hand.

And for your appeal to the strong favour of Socinianisme in the beginning of his fisib argument, you speake of, you neither there nor here doe shew in whatthat ranknesse lieth. There, if you remember, it had such a *Visor* on the face of it, that a man cannot tell what the face of it is, or its complexion.

Farther you say, none of the 3. Chr. conceived or delivered that exposition that is faith is imputed in a proper sense. But it is cleare for Socinus; he holdeth the proper sense, and so

faith imputed. So doth Mr. *Watson*, you cannot but know it, and it is your *Helena*.

But now let us come to Mr. *Wr.* his arguments, by which he proveth the same, and improveth the false exposition; they are 7. You doe not so much as lay them down or answer formally to any one of them.

All the answer you make is by *Quetions*, and they are but of some things contained in them, so that all the rest is left unquestioned and unanswered. I will not do so with your *Quetions*. Let us heare, what are they?

Quest. 1. You would know from what Fountain Mr. *W.* dranke that draught of Divinity, that faith Rom. 5. 1, 2. taken in a proper sense, shoulde be a part of our obedience to the moral Law?

You adde, intire obedience to the whole Law was required of Adam, but not to believe in Christ, the Law not being of faith, Gal. 3.12.

To the first I answer. That faith which justifieth in relation to its object, considered as a worke or vertue in a proper sense, is (as is supposed by such as are learned) commanded in the morall Law. They say:

Where the L. requireth me to have no other God, and willith me to have him to be mine by faith; he willith me to believe in Christ, without whom God never offereth himselfe to be, nor can be mine, by whom it is I believe in him.

And where the argument runneth, *I am the Lord thy God, there faith in Christ is required, to whom be it first a God, and in whom mine.*

They take faith in Christ to be a speciall part of internall worship, such as when I performe it to Christ, I performe it not to him alone, but to God, not onely himselfe, but the other persons. He that believeth in me, believeth not in me, but in him that sent me.

And so they take it that the morall Law is the perfect rule of our worship of God.

I suppose faith in Christ undeniably since the fall prescribed and called for and answered by Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham; by what? but the morall Law. The Gospel giveth indeed,

but it is the Law that requireth it. They say:

That faith required in the Law, none ever doubted: faith so all that is written, then to the Gospel, to God as revealed in Christ, the lively faith which worketh by love, which is none but faith in Christ; or else the dead faith, that which is in the Devils.

Againe, that that Grace is but one, and so that it is but the same faith by which we believe in Christ and God. *For that grace, without which other graces required are not.* That radicall grace, without which other graces and their workes cannot be such as God requireth, such hope, such love, such feare, such joy, such prayer, such praise, as God requireth suitable to him as a God in covenants and a Father, without which they cannot please God, neither aime at or attaine Gods ends, shoud not be excluded; the Law that requireth those graces else and their workes, requireth that faith; and that, if faith in Christ be not required in the Law, infidelity will not be sinne, neither can it condemne him that is under the same.

That the rule of faith, &c. is Gods will contained in his word, and that the manner of worship and faith is ordinarily given to the second Commandement.

For Adam in innocency, there might be a bond on him to believe in Christ, though not as a Lambe and slaine, but as only Mediator betweene God and man for eternall life. I am sure he was ever the beire and Lord of life, and that eternall life was for ever in him.

An obedienciall power to believe what ever word or revelation of God we ordinarily meet with in orthodox Divines, as for obedience to Gods commands simply, those, at least some, that dispute the contrary, drinke deeply of Arminian streames: had you given us reasons against it, we would have considered them.

When as you say *the Law is not of faith*, Gal. 3. 12. It proveth not that faith in a proper sense is not required in the Law, neither neede I to finde out the true sense, it not being to purpose.

Our Writers are of this opinion, that faith in Christ is in the Law.

Fides qua opus pertinet ad primam legem
neque evadere potes. Sybrand. ad Bert. p. 57.
Quin dicas nos opere legis justificari, si dixeris
nos hinc quatenus opus nostrum est justificari.

it. Thou must say us to be justified by a worke of the Law,
if thou shalt affirme us justified by faith as a worke of ours. He
goeth on.

Nostram sententiam probat magnus ille
Zanch. de natur. Dei, l. 4. c. 2. Legis nomine
intelligit omnia que lex præcipit; præcipit
autem non tantum externa facta sed imprimis
internâ renovationem, cordis circumcisio nem
dilectionem Dei, (nota) fidei. Ego cum Scru-
piuia dicit per gratiam Dei nos justificari,
minime autem per legem, omnem renovationem
& omnem internam & externam ho-
nam actionem nostram ab officio justificandi
excludit, & soli gratuito favori ascribit.

Lxxvii, he excludeth all renovation, and all internal, and exter-
nal good action of ours from the office of justifying, and ascri-
beth it only to free grace.

It is true, the Law of works requires faith.

Ques. 2. You require where Wotton or Goodwine teach
we are justified (meritoriously, or else the charge vanisbeth) by
a worke, by a work of obedience to the Law?

Answ. Mr. W. requireth of you where he chargeth you
with it in plain words? his words are they that teach that,
faith in a proper sense is counted for righteousness, doe
teach that we are justified by a worke of obedience to the
Law performed in our owne persons: and that God on
our behalfe requires no other righteousness for justification:
which doctrine he saith the Apostle condemneth,
Popery, and worse then Popery, where all graces else are
conjoynd with faith.

To omit that, here you imply justification by a worke
of the Law, confessed, so it be not meritoriously, in which
I suppose you are alone.

Ques. 3. You demand how Mr. Walker proves that the
rh... if

So saith he in this cause to that
Arminian Prince Bertius, Faith in a
worke appertaineth to the first Com-
mandement, neither canst thou evade

it. Thou must say us to be justified by a worke of the Law,
if thou shalt affirme us justified by faith as a worke of ours. He

Great Zanchius proveth our opi-
nion. By the word Law bee un-
derstandeth all which the Law re-
quireth, but that requireth not only
externall workes, but chiefly inter-
nal renovation, circumcision of the
heart, the Love of God, (note
it) faith. When as therefore the
Scripture saith we are justified by
the grace of God, and not by the

Vtrum est le-
gem operū re-
quierte idem.
Cham l. 22. c. 2.
Sect. 9.

righteousnesse imputed to Abraham was perfect conformity to the Law.

I suppose it is evident, because conformity to the Law is in the definition of righteousness, which if it be not perfect, hath neede of pardon, cannot procure it of the Lord, cannot beare a man out in Gods sight, cannot afford peace with God, or conscience; can never make a man *holie, unblasphemous, unreprovable in the sight of God; white as Snow, and whiter than the Snow;* perfect him for ever; all which are true of Abraham by the righteousness which was imputed, and so is it of the Church by Gods word.

As righteousness was imputed to him, Rom. 4. v. 6. 11; so it was perfect conformity to Gods Law, which Christs righteousness is, not faith in a proper sense.

Quest. 4. How doth it follow that God must needs erre, lie, or judge unrighteously, if he imputeth righteousness without works?

To this Mr. Walker is not bound to answer, he affirmed it not. But that your opinion, that God counts faith for righteousness, that is, thinketh, judgeth, and esteemeth it to be righteousness in a proper sense, chargeth God with error and falsehood in his judgement, and so is blasphemy.

Quest. 5. How Mr. Walker proves that the imputation of faith for righteousness maketh the satisfaction of Christ and his perfect fulfilling of the Law a vaine and needless thing, which Mr. Goodwine conceiveth it establisheth both the one and the other.

1. I answer. This, if not proved, yet leaveth the argument in force to that part, viz. that it denieth the meanes whereby God is revealed to be infinitly just, mercifull, and wise, which he urged, which hath not so much as a question to undermine it.

2. These are done by Christ our Surety, his perfect obedience in our nature; in this wisdom, mercie, and iustice, are revealed, as Mr. Walker and our Church in the Homily. With which, though faith in a Relative sense doth consist, yet in a proper sense, excluding the imputation of the

righteousnesse of Christ to justification, it is opposed, your selfe putting the one with Arminius say, and not the other.

Indeed if faith be that righteousness or instead thereof, that of Christ is vaine and void; and if this righteousness of Christ be it, faith in that sense, (as workes are) excluded in this matter, and exclude each other.

*Et tu Thefis est causa quare statuan vos
bis (ut tamen vobis ipfis constate vobis) ne-
cessario eo tandem devenerendum esse, ut
cum Serveto Socino, &c. medium, habeat sa-
tisfactionem pro nobis factam omnino colla-
ris, dicatisque neque Christum nobis justifi-
cam peperisse, neque nos ipsius justitia nobis
imputata justificant. Ad Bert p. 35.*

*Quorundam enim justitia Christi si non ha-
bet in se vim justificandi, & si nos non justi-
ficatur? p. 87.*

*to what end is the righteousness of Christ, if it bath not in its force
of Justifying, and if it justifie us not? Which (say I) it
cannot, if faith in a proper sense be imputed for righte-
ousnesse.*

Let the Reader observe the argument and proofe of Mr. Walker, and this answer or question (as the rest) will appeare not to be satisfactory, but a lying under the burthen rather.

Quest. 6. How Mr. Walker can bring it about that the making of Christ's satisfaction ours, as truly as if we had performed the same in our owne persons, shoulde be a meanes whereby God is revealed infinitely just, wise, and mercifull? Mr. G. conceiveth that insufficient, because a man having sinned could not be justified by personall performance of the Law.

1. That the righteousness of Christ is so truly ours for righteousness as if we had fulfilled the Law, you boggle not at: our Church is cleare; so are learned Writers. Indeed by faith he and his righteousness are truly ours.

2. Your supposition to be a sinner and personally to performe the Law, is a contradiction, to fulfill it and not done of Mr. Wrs:

3. When as Mr. Walker putteth Christ's righteousness, his

*This Thesis of thine (faith Sybran-
dus) is a reason why I may conclude
(if yet you will be like our selves)
you must as lengh come to this, that
with Servetus and Socinus, &c. yet
altogether take away the merit or satis-
faction made for us, and say Christ
neither to have brought forth righteous-
nesse to us, nor us to be justified by his
righteousnesse imputed unto us — For*

his meaning is his perfect obedience to the Law, our full debt Active and Passive righteousness, wherein satisfaction for sinne is infoulded, so that the person is nobly faire; God seeme to be just, mercifull, and wise, this is sufficient.

Quest. 7. Whether God did not dispense with his justice in passing by the sinner, inflicting punishment upon the innocent, and whether he will call the one or the other an act of Justice? Mr. G. conceives that Gods justice led him directly to the sinner to execute vengeance on him, and that it was his mercy that led him aside from him that deserved death, to another that had not deserved it.

1. I answer, God was just and merciful in our *Justification* by faith in Christ, as before is largely shewed out of the word of God, and orthodox Writers; neither can either be denied. It is freely by grace to declare his righteousness. It was an act of justice not denying mercy, and an act of mercy not excluding justice.

2. Though justice leadeth to the offendour, and not to the innocent party, here it cannot be so, the case is altered, the L. Christ cannot be said to be innocent, but as our Surety a sinner, our sinnes being on his score. He voluntarily accepted it, and undertooke eternally to give these eternall life. So is he proposed to us since the fall by God himselfe, his taking our nature, doing all righteousness, and doing for us, proclaims the same, that he was a *Surety*, in this name he must fulfill all righteousness. He must die, it was his meat and drinke to doe, and he offered up himselfe. God spared not his Sonne, at his command the sword smote Christ, the man that is Gods fellow, he declared himselfe righteous.

To exact a debt of a *Surety*, willingly giving the Creditor the hand, and let the principall not able to pay, to go free, is justice: mercy indeed, did sweetly meete in accepting a *Surety*, and giving him, and Christ accepting the bargaine, and giving himselfe to be the *Surety*, whereby that justice was satisfied.

Quest. 8. What moved Mr. W. to thinke or say that those that

that bold imputation of faith for righteousness should deny communion with Christ in his satisfaction, when as Mr. G. still affirmeth that that faith is ordained by God to bring men into communion and fellowship with Christ in his satisfaction, and by virtue of such ordination justifieth instrumentally, or which is the same, is imputed for righteousness.

Quoniam non
revera & pro-
prie sed impro-
prie, & per si-
militudinem
quandam unū
cum illo corpus
efficiuntur. De
reconcil. p. 16.
¶ p. 110.

1. He might well so thinke of Master *Wotton*, who though he acknowledge him, and that by the Spirit; yet he saith we make one body with Christ, not indeed, and properly, but improperly, and by a certaine similitude.

When as he saith it is not indeed, he denieth union and communion, which is so much the more absurd, when as yet he confesseth it caused by *faith* and the *Spirit*, then union, by which, there cannot be one more reall.

2. You denying the imputation to our Justification, deny union and communion so farre, nay, both seeing they are inseparable.

3. The fellowship you affirme is not to fellowship with the righteousness of Christ, but the effect thereof or returne, pardon, which is not all.

4. When as you say *faith justifieth instrumentally*, &c. yet you deny it as an hand laying hold of and receiving Christs righteousness which justifieth, that it so justifieth as the hand that receiveth money maketh rich, which though it be an ordinary expreſſure of the *Learned*, you slighted and rejected in the Pulpit as the *Remonstrants*, who give it a *nug*.

5. For my part I suspect your calling it an instrument, there is somewhat under it, for if so be that faith be acknowledged an instrument indeed, it cannot justify in a proper sense, which may be the reason that *Arminius*, &c. deny it, but figuratively.

Nemo ignorat instrumento per Metonymiam tribui quod est instrumentati, (as *Sybrandus to Bertinus.*) p. 72. Si dicas penicillum dealbare parietem, omnes per Metonymiam intelligunt hoc dici; Penicillo datur quod est materia, albedinis. *L.* p. 77.

the wall, all understand this to be spoken by a *Metonymie*, that is given to the Pencell which belongeth to the matter, whiting.

This he sheweth out of *Ursinus*.

It is commonly said we are justified by faith correlatively, that is, we are justified by that which is correlative to faith, forsooth by the merit of Christ to which it is referred, or which faith doth apprehend; for faith and the satisfaction of Christ are correlatives, as the receiver and that which is received.

But then we speake rightly, because when faith is understood of the formall cause of Justification: and the sense is, the merit of Christ doth justify, not faith. That which is apprehended justifieth, not the instrument apprehending. But justification is also without relation rightly given to faith, as to an instrumentall cause. We are justified by faith, that is by faith as by a meaneas:

*for usually the effect of the efficient cause, is given to the instrument. But when it is said. Faith is imputed to him for righteousness, and other such propositions, they are necessarily to be understood only correlatively, so as faith is the instrument of righteousness apprehended, and as it were the hand by which the righteousness of Christ is received. So the learned man *Ursinus*. But to the next Question.*

Quest. 9. To your ninth Question. How your opinion denies the infinite justice of God, to stand in strenght or to require such a satisfaction as Christ, God and man made? when as they conceive no possibility of such imputation, but by vertue of such satisfaction, nor can they imagine such a faith to be imputed without supposing a Mediator, Christ God and man, on which it should rest, who gives it the name and being that it hath. It is true, they deny that the justice of God simply and absolutely required such a satisfaction as Christ God and man made, but on supposition that God would bring many sonnes to glory,

and save what was lost, they deny is not.

Gods justice cannot stand in strength where men are justified by that which is no satisfaction to it, faith in a proper sense. And where the satisfaction which the Law requires, is not so much as imputed to them for their Justification.

2. Infinite justice requires such a satisfaction as Christ God and man made, to Justification, because in that God declareth himselfe just, as before.

3. Imputation of faith by vertue of the satisfaction of Christ, is to say that Christ merited that faith should be imputed (as I conceive) and that Socinianisme, Osterodus.

*Non detraho illam sanguini & morti Chri-
sti, sed tribuo illam morti & sanguini Christi, from the blood and death of Christ, but
quatenus sanguis & mors in nobis efficiunt I give it to the death and blood of
tas res propter quas Deus nos justificat, Christ, so farre forth as his blood and
nempe fidem. See Sybraen, ad Bert. p. 10. death work in us those things for which
God doth justify us, forsooth faith.*

4. Though they cannot imagine a faith imputed, not supposing a Mediator on whom, yet they deny faith in a Relative sense, taking in the Mediator, to be imputed, dispute against it for the proper sense, which satisfieth not justice, but destroyeth it as before.

5. Gods bringing many sonnes to glory, and to save what should be lost by Christs satisfaction of his justice was Gods eternall and immutable purpose. The glory of justice and mercy Gods maine ends required it; as Christ did in time, God determined eternally: thus eternall will determined it selfe, and to consider otherwise is but the worke of an idle braine, there is no reality in the Lord to answer it.

*Quest. 10. To the tenth question I answer, it appear-
-reth you hold God can and doth by his Soveraigne pow-
er and will, things contrary to his justice, in your opin-
on: Seeing you teach God can, doth, and will justify men,
without satisfaction made by the perfect righteousness of
Christ their Surety, accounted to them, putting faith in a
proper sense, a created imperfect grace imputed for righte-
ousnesse*

ousnesse which cannot satisfie justice, which cannot stand with or declare the same, so that either Gods end is not to declare his righteouſneſſe against the Apostle in justification, Rom. 3. 26. or else you destroy that end, and so establish such a ſovereigne power and will.

Quest. 11. And to the eleventh, to accept for righteouſneſſe that which is not ſo according to Gods Law, is contrary to justice, ſeeing it is a justification of the wicked, abomination to the Lord; the holding of a guilty person innocent, which the Lord will not doe, being the Judge of all the world he cannot doe, doing right.

When as God accepts Christs righteouſneſſe for the debt of a beleever, and imputeth it to him, that righteouſneſſe is not the beleavers personall righteouſneſſe, that is righteouſneſſe performed in his owne person, ſo no flesh living can be justified in Gods sight; but the righteouſneſſe of Christ his Surey, his Head, his by reall union and communion, as if it were personall righteouſneſſe: the Surey's payment of a debt for the principall is all one as if the principall did himſelfe make ſatisfaction to the Creditor.

Quest. 12. Where Christs righteouſneſſe is denied to be the righteouſneſſe of a true beleever? I anſwer, where you deny Christs righteouſneſſe to be imputed for righteouſneſſe, and to be that whereby we are made just before God: for those words formally I finde not Mr. W. to contend about them, neither are men denominated ever from what is internall and ſuch a forme. It may be from that which is outward, as Doctor Daventur largely anſwerteth the Pontificaw. Neither is it enough that Christs righteouſneſſe is a meritorious cause of justification, it muſt be ſo applied by faith that the beleever may be thereby made righteous, which is denied where there is no imputation thereof for righteouſneſſe. The word faith *be it holy, unreprovable, unblamable in the sight of God*, which cannot be but as by that which hath merit and worth, ſo applied and made mine; all the money in the world will not enrich any man untill it be his, injoyed to that end. But to that which is a com-

mon evasion to you and *Romanists* in this controversie, making Christ onely the efficient and meritorious cause, more after in due place, where I shall shew Mr. G. *sense Apocryphall, Popish*, confuted by our learned Protestants, answering them.

Quest. 13. To the thirteenth, the insufficiency of Christ's righteousness and satisfaction for all, even Scripture sufficiency is there denied where *Christ's righteousness is denied to fit all men and women of all callings and conditions*, and counted an unreasonable thing, *as that one garment should fit all statures and proportions of bodies, or the same stooe all feete of all sizes.*

And why Sir, should not that fit all which is the Sonne of Gods fulfilling all righteousness? when as by it all are perfectly righteous that beleve, men, women, of all statures and conditions.

Either it fitteth all, so that all sorts are perfectly righteous by it applied alone, or none, which might have been said plainly; or being so, righteous, they are so by somewhat else, and you must name that. What for men and women of all sorts, of all callings and conditions?

I thought there had been *neither male nor female*, but *alone in Christ*; and that it were vaine else for all to put him on in Baptisme sacramentally, and by beleeving really, that the precept was vaine (and impossible to some) that requireth it.

Did we grant faith in a proper sense, that righteousness, or imputed for it, that would serve all, fit all in your opinion, belike; or else it is liable to the same exception, *the bride is arrayed with it*, and the Builder and Maker of it both maketh it and judgeth it fit: no matter for such curious speculators else.

And when as you grant an absolute necessity of it, and sufficiencie for a world of sinners, to justification, neither man or woman of this or that stature or proportion, nor the tallest or biggest have any cause to feare, that if he beleeve he shall not be fitted. To deny this fitting, is to deny sufficiencie, but this crochet savoureth more of the flesh than of the spirit.

Quest. 14.

Ques. 14. To the fourteenth, thus which Mr. Walker saith overthrows the satisfaction of Christ, hath this reason, that if we satisfy Gods justice by our Surety Christ there is no Pardon, for pardon and satisfaction are contraries, so Mr. W. So some of the stamp, Mr. Wr. disputeth against it. In this you are as a Socratical disputant, wisely too, as in all that kinde of answer to Mr. Walkers reasons.

Pena & venia
sunt adversa.

Sir, our satisfaction by Christ to Gods justice and Gods mercy will stand together in that name, every true Christian man may be cal'd, a fulf'ler of the Law, what our infirmity lacked, Christ's justice hath supplied. So your Mother taught you in her Doctrine of Justification, and to say that I by my Surety have satisfied for my selfe, or debt, is no more then to say, that in him and by him a believer hath fulfilled the Law; neither doth it deny, but establish, that Christ hath satisfied the justice of God for me.

Ques. 15. To the fifteenth, It is monstrous to reason to deny Legall righteousness to justification, seeing Justification is a making man just.

This denieth where withall both personall righteousness, and the righteousness of Christ imputed. Mr. Wotton teacheth you, righteousness is the forme of Justification; and, it is certaine that the forme of Justification consisteth in righteousness, and Justification is indeed the proper and true effect of righteousness, in what manner soever that righteousness is understood to be communicated or imputed to us; of this he saith, neither is this the judgement alone of Pontificians, but of our owne Divines. He nameth those words out of Polanus. For a man to be accounted just without justice or righteousness, is al one as for a man to be accounted learned without learning, wise without wisdome.

That Justification (and in that name) should consist only in remission of sinnes, excluding the righteousness of Christ imputed is as unreasonable, it is without the cause by which. You tell us you have handled it at large, but

14. *proprius & unus effectus justitiae, quoquo modo ea justitia imputari possit communicari nobis intelligatur.* Part. 1. & 2. c. 3. Sect. 1. 3. Neque pontificorum sed nostrorum Theologorum sententia est. Nam sine justitia iustum censeri perinde esset a fine doctrina doctum, sapientia sapientem censeri. Ib. Sect. 4. Idib. Sect. 4.

not where one may meeete with it, had it bene put here it should have beeene considered. The joynt testimony of many a worthy Divine is but let us a Wooll-gathering.

For *Calvyn* it shall be tried. I believe you mention him as Mr. *Wotton* doth the Church of England. He going about to prove Remission of sinnes to be the formall cause of Jutification, triumpheth in the judgement of the Church of England.

*Justificacio est
remissio peccatorum.*

L 2.c.3. Sc.3.

It saith, *Justification is remission of sinnes; and this Justification or justice is received, accepted, and approved of God for our full and perfell Justification.* To which he addeth, *In whiche words the whole nature of Justification is comprehended, only in remission of sinnes, and that it is affirmed the full and perfell Justification of God himselfe accepting it in judgement: and then addeth, neither is there in the two other parts of that Sermon, a fittable or letter which signifieth any thing to be wanting, or to be repugnant to this opinion.* So he.

When he yet cannot be ignorant but our Church urgeth the satisfaction of Christ his death and obedience to the Law, not excluding his obedience to the Law, but our workes, as before.

Our Homily sheweth a necessary concurrence on Christis part of justice, that is the satisfaction of his justice, which the Apostle calleth the justice of God, and it consisteth in paying our ransome and fulfilling of the Law. So the grace of God doth not ~~shut out~~ the justice of God in our Justification, but the justice of man in our works. — And after laying down our insufficiency, it extolleth Gods mercy without any desert or deserving of ours, to prepare for us the most precious Jewels of Christis body and blood, whereby our ransome might be fully paid, the Law fulfilled, and his justice fully satisfied, so that Christ is now the righteousness of all them that truly believe in him, be for them paid the ransome by his death, be for them fulfilled the Law by his life. So that now in and by him every true Christian man may be called a fittfiller of the Law, for as much as that whiche their infirmity lacked, Christis justice hath supplied. These are added for the more full understanding of what was delivered before, and must not be left out. Nay, Christ and his obedience

obedience are established the righteousness of believers, and so that by which we are just before God, as before out of Mr. Weston.

But to Calvin, I grant he saith, *Justification confitit aliam in remission of finis, and that we are not otherwise made just.* And yet I assert, that in the exclusive he did not shut out the imputation of Christ's righteousness, but onely renovation, inherent righteousness and good works. So to shew it he inforreth, *for if they should be esteemed by workes,* he disputeth against the Popish opinion, not against imputation of Christ's righteousness, and for both, read the 23. *Sall.* where you shall finde his dispute to be against *Stell. 13.* workes, in these words.

That vain conceipt vanisheb, that a man is therefore justified by faith, because by that he partakeb the Spirit of God, whereby he is made just; which is more contrary to the former doctrine, than that it can be reconciled. He excludeth workes not the righteousness of Christ. One place more there.

It cannot be doubtfull but he mainteinh righteousness of his name that is tanght to seek it aw of himself: where wryting the text, 2 Cor. 5. 21. he addeth.

See, our righteousness is not in us, but in Christ, onely belonging to us by that right, because we are partakers of Christ, seeing with him we possesse all his riches.

And speaking of Rom 8. 3. faith. *And is makyng nothing to the contrary, that in another place, he teacheth that finis was condemned of finis in the flesh of Christ, that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in w. Where he meaneh no other fulfilling, then that whch we obtaine by imputation.* But

enim iure communicalat nobiscum Dom. Christus suum iustitium ac mirabiliter quodam modo quantum pertinet ad Dei iudicium vim eius in nos transfundit. Aliud non lenitatem abscondebat ex altera sententia quam paulo post posuerat, Quemadmodum per unius inobedientiam constituti sumus peccatores, ita per obedientiam eius iustificari Quid aliud est in

*Sola remissio
peccatorum
confitit, & non
aliter fieri pos-
sunt.*

Nam si operibus estimantur

*Si quidem eranescit augmentum illud,
ideo iustificari hominem fide, quoniam illa
spiritum dei participat qua justus redditur;
quod magis est concursum superiori doctri-
ni quam ut conciliari usquam queat.*

*Neque enim dubium quin si in opere pro-
prie iustificari qui iustitiam extulit se querere
doceatur.*

*Vide, non in nobis sed in Christo esse iusti-
tiam nostram, nebi tantum et iure compe-
tere quia Christifumus particeps, siquidem
omnes ejus officia cum ipsa possidemus.*

*Ubi non aliud
complementum si
defigunt quam
quod impati-
tione confe-
quimus. Eq-*

Christi obedientia collacare nostram iustitiam, nisi assertere ea sola nos haberi possimus, quia Christi obedientia nobis accepta fuitur ad iustitiam nostra esse? quare mihi elegantissime videatur Ambrosius hujus iustitiae paradigma in benedictione Jacob statuisse, nempe quenadmodum ille primogenituram a seipso non meritus, habim fratri occultatus, eiusque veste indurus, quic optimum odorem spirabat, seipsum insinuavit patri ut suo commodo sub aliena persona benedictionem accepiret: Ita nos sub Christi primogenito nostri fratris preventio partem deligiscere, ut testimoniis iustitiae a conspectu Dei referatur. — Et sane ita se res habet, nam quo in salutem soror facie Dei comparcamus, bono ejus odore fragrant nos necesse est, & ejus perfectione virtus nostra obtegi ac se pelici.

the L. Christ doth in such sorts communicate his righteousness with us, that after a certayne marvellous manner he pouereth the force thereof into us, so much as appertaineth to the judgement of God. It appears he did no otherwise mean by the other sentence which he had spoken a little before. As by the disobedience of one man we were made sinners, so by the obedience of one man we are justified. What is it else to set our righteousness in the obedience of Christ, but to affirm that hereby only we are accounted righteous, because the obedience of Christ is imputed unto us, as if it were our own. Therefore methinks that Ambrose hath excellently well shewed how

Sunt tamen qui existiment iustitiam quae ad justificationem flagitatur a Calvino etiam in imputatione iustitiae Christi esse positam ex floriam numero est ipse Bellar. qui de Calvino tractat. Johannes Calvinus admittit quidem cum Lutheranis non esse in nobis aliam inherenter iustitiam & imputari Christi iustitiam & propter eam condonari peccata.

Now let these parcels be laid together, and no man of conscience not desirous to cavill, can deny, but though he excludeth workes, he doth not the imputation of the righteousness of Christ.

When Mr. Wotton had forced Calvine, yet he confesseth, There are yet that think that the righteousness which is required to justification, by Calvine to be also placed in imputation of the righteousness of Christ. Of this number is Bellarmine

bimself,

himselfe, who were most of Calvines. John Calvines truly admitteth with the Lutherans, that there is now in us any inherent righteousness, and Christis righteousness to be imputed, and for it sinnes to be forgiven. And after :

Calvines when in his *Institutiones* and *Antidote* he contendeth justification to be placed in remission of sinnes, doth not exclude the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, but internall renovation and sanctification. And he reprehendeth the same Calvines, because he maketh a double formall cause of justification.

And now for Pareus, give me leave to shew his judgement of Calvines in this matter. When as Bellarmine urged Calvines, as you doe to the same end, Pareus answereth.

But that vaine wrangler (Bellarmine) argueth himselfe of Calumny, for above he did confess that Calvines did not exclude the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. And here againe once more he confesseth Calvines with the Lutherans to acknowledge the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, and not imputation of sinnes. If therefore Calvines did place justification in remission of sinnes, and did not exclude the imputation of the righteousness of Christ; what doth be differ from the Lutherans?

And then answering to that of his Antidote, he saith.

But in saying this, he doth differ neither from himselfe, nor from Luther, Melanthon, or any other Protestant : for that particle Alone, doth not exclude the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, which being Bellarmine confessed, but it excludeth renovation, which those of Trent require in their definition with remission of

Nam cum Calvines instit. l. 3. c. 11. Sct. 22. Et in Antidoto ad Concil. Trid. ad fess. 6 contendit justificacionem esse positam in remissione peccatorum, non excludit imputationem iustitie Christi, sed internam renovationem & sanctificationem. Bell. de justif. l. 2. c. 8. Sct. Iohann eundem etiam Calvines reprehendit quod causam formalē iustificationis duplē faciat, c. 2. Sct. sed non minor. Who also addeth, Calvino responder Pareus. Part 1. l. 2. c. 4. Sct. 6.

Sed inanis ille vigilator ipsum seCalvinez arguit, supra enim lacabatur, Calvinez imputationem iustitie Christi non excludet, hic etiam denouo facetur Calvinez cum Lusberano agnoscere imputationem iustitie Christi & non imputationem peccatorum. Si igitur Calv. justificacionem in remissione peccatorum constituit & imputationem iustitie Christi non excludit, quid a Lub. dissentit?

Vtrum hoc dicendo neque à se neque à Luther, Melanthon, vel quōquam alio evan gelicorum dissentit, particula enim Sola, non excludit imputationem iustitie Christi, quod fassus est Bellar. sed excludit renovationem quam Tridentini in sua definitione cum remissione peccatorum ad justificacionem requirunt hoc respectu etiam Lutherus in sola remissione, & non imputatione peccatorum justificacionem collat. Melanthon quoque, sic Martin. Castig. de justif. l. 2. c. 6. p. 444.

sinner to justification. In this respect also Luther doth place justification only in remission and not imputation of sinnes. Melanthon also doth Martir thus Paven.

L. de justif. c.
5. p. 4.

Doctor Dunham may be added. For though many of the Divines as hath beene said have taught, that mere justification remission of sinnes is only required; yet their assertion is so to be understood at Bellar. himselfe understandeth Calvyn, or Spokyn in opposition to Papists, who say that to justification concurre, not onely remission of sinnes, but also inward renovation, or sanctification. To contradict them our Divines have said that we are justified by remission only, or not imputation of sinnes. Wherewith alwayes concreth imputation of righteousness, and not by renovation or sanctification. Their meaning therefore by the exclusive particle Onely, was not to exclude imputation of righteousness, which inseparably accompanieth not imputation of sinnes as Saint Paul proveth, Rom. 4. 6. 8. and Bellar, himselfe confesseth, but infusion of righteousness or renovation.

Quartam recentem Galvini qui (ut ille ait) formalem causam justificationis in sola remissione peccatorum sicut docet. At nemo recitat Galvini imputationem obedientie Christi requirere absque qua nulla remissio peccatorum obtinetur. Si igitur quis a Galvino quæfuisset quidnam tandem illud sit propter quod & per quod impius justificatur; respondet, propter & per meritum filii Dei, hec causa est remissionis, & causa acceptationis, hec causa translationis a mortis ad gloriam vite; Deus hanc filii sui obedientiam & justitiam respiciens ut a nobis fide apprehensam ab initio recipit nos in gloriam justificatorum. Deus perpetuo intuens hanc eandem justitiam nobis donavit & applicat in reliquo vite nostrae cursu habet nos prejustificatis. De Iusti. habit. c. 22, p. 313.

of translation from the state of death to the state of life. God respecking this obedience and righteousness of his Sonne, as apprehended of us by faith, from the beginning received us into the state of justified ones. God alwayes beholding this same righteousness given unto us and applied, in the remaining course of our life, accounted us for justified ones.

Chamier to Bellar. objecting as you doe, first answereth

out of Bellar. himselfe, then out of Calvina, Instit. l.3. c.13. Sect. 3. to which he addeth, What can be more manifest? and Sect. 3. to which he saith, Could any thing more be said against that segment of Bellarmine? Againe he provereth the same. We are sure that cannot first be (that we be not accounted sinners) without imputation of the righteousness of Christ; thence the words of Calvine, he doth absolve us by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ.

And before, *We* (Protestants) doe altogether conceive the imputation of the righteousness of Christ the foundation of the same justification, which being neglected, that is altogether now as all, neither in whole nor in part, howsoever it may be conceived at much as in thought.

I will adde another witness for Calvine, Polanus. Now Partit. p. 214. if any man will say that the found Teachers, Calvines; and others, doe affirm that justice or righteousness is the forgiveness of sinnes. And againe, that justice consisteth in remission of sinnes, we must know that it is very certaine they speake metonymically, meaning so as that either justice in their writings, is Quid enim alii the same that justification, because we cannot be justified but by ad peccata po- justicie, or else that justice is said to be the remission of sinnes, tuister occulta- because justice is the cause of remission or forgivenesse of sinnes; re nostram pre- and that Calvine doth speake by Metonymia, in plaine out of am. Sec. Justin. other places of his works, &c. l. 3. Instit. c.17. Sect. 8.— And ad Diagram. si in another place he plainly provereth that by, through, and for Christis righteousness we obtaine forgivenesse of sinnes: and c.3. Sect. 19. having obtained forgivenesse of sinnes by means of Christis righteousness comming betwixt— and more plainly, c. 14. Sect. 12. and c. 11. Sect. 1. and c. 14. Sect. 13. man- being covered with the righteousness of Christ pleaseth God and obtaineth forgivenesse of sinnes.

So that if Calvine himselfe, and all these worthies are to be credited, nay Bellarmine and Mr. Weston themselves, you wrong Calvine, and hence the places you talke of our

Ponitur quicquid
magis contra
Bell. fragmentum
dicitur l.3. c.15.
Sect. 20. &
Sect. 21.

Ceteri sumus ne illud quidem (nos pecca-
tores confiteri) prius confundare posse abique im-
putara iustitia Christi; unde Calvini verba,
iustitiae imputatione nos absolvitur.

Impunitationem iustitiae Christi omni-
no consensus ejusdem iustificationis fundum
est, qua neglecta pro�ius illa nulla
sit, neque in toto neque in parte, quo-
modo conque tantum vel cogitatione con-
cipi queat. ib.

of other Divines may receive their answer.

Quest. 16. To the sixteenth question, where the words are, &c. and that you cannot finde in Rom. 5. 19. Rom. 3. 4. Rom. 10. 4. so much as one expresse word either of the communication, much leſſe of the imputation of Christ's righteousness and ſatisfaction to us, least of all of their being made formally righteous by ſuch imputation.

To this, firſt your ſelfe graunt (you ſay) we are justified formally too, by the communication of Christ's righteousness to us in a ſenſe, viz. in as muſch as we obtaine by ſuch communication remiſſion of ſinnes which is our formall justification (with you;) ſo that the thing is in a ſenſe, though not in expreſſe words, and you ſee it too.

2. Nay you grant remiſſion an effect of righteousness communicated by theſe textes; not only pardon, but communication of righteousness, ſo your words; ſo that here is more then a meritorious cauſe, here is application by faith, which you will not other where acknowledge.

3. Mr. W. denieth not remiſſion of ſinnes an effect, he with Calvine and the learned but now mentioned grant it, but that which all contend is also imputation and communication to that end, without which pardon cannot be, as before.

4. And Sir, if remiſſion doth formally justify, it is justice, as before out of Mr. Wotton, and ſo conformity to Gods Law deny one and you deny all.

See Dr. Dav. de bhab. Iust. c. 27. arg. 2. p. 363. & arg. 4. p. 365. and others.
Formz conſtituac.

But to thoſe textes what you cannot ſee others have, and you might, had you received counſell of ſome dead and living ſtill: that is, consulted with the learned, the words Rom. 5. 19. that by the obedience of one man, ſhall be conſtituted righteous. Here is righteousness conſtituting righteous, and then formall, for it is the nature of the forme to conſtitute.

I know not what you can except but that the forme is internall, and that what is externall cannot be ſo termed, and hence it is that you ſo often put in (that ſophiſtiall term, as ours anſwer the Papifts in the ſame controverſie) formally: and if that will not ſerve your turne, as was ſhewed

shewed you at *Chester* out of Doctor *Daventur*, indeed, put a man constituted by righteousness, righteous, if it be not by his owne personall righteousness, it must be by another, Christ. The place that was then read unto you was:

We grant that the forme of *Justification* by which a justified person is not onely reputed and denominatid before God, but made or constituted so. But because he is said to be justified by a passive denomination (as it is knowne out of Grammer it selfe) It is not absolutely necessary that this denomination be taken either from an inherent forme, or that it should suppose an inherent forme: for such passive denominations sometimes respect in an inherent forme, as when we say the wall to be whitid: and sometimes not, as when we say a man to be beloved, honoured, condemned, absolved. For all these are truly spoken of him in whom

there is not found an inherent forme which may be a ground for such denominations. William of Paris noted this. Passive denominations or predicationes are made in things in which they are not, in them, or to them, or of them. Where he citeth *Vaf-*
Ur imbelle &
ques the *Jesuite* rejecting that kind of argument as weak
and unprofitable. Saying,

I will not fight against this kinde of denomination with a certaine kinde of common argument whiche some use, forsooth that this denomination of a just man seemeth to be of these, which require an internall forme. And by and by, A thing may be said to be just by that which is externall and anothers righteousness.

And *Chamier*. Every one that is just is so said indeed from righteousness, not necessarily from what is inherent; there is imputed righteousness, there is righteousness of such as are com-

Justificationis formam concedimus illud per quod homo justificatus non modo reputatur & denominatur coram Deo, sed efficitur sive constituitur: quia autem homo dicitur justificatus denominatione passiva (ut ex ipsa Grammatica notum est) non est absolute necessarium, ut haec denominatio aut peratur a forma inherente, aut supponatur formam inherenter. Hujusmodi enim denominatioes passiva, quandoque respiciunt formam inherenter, ut cum patrem dicimus dealbatum: quandoque non, ut cum dicimus hominem amatum, honoratum, daminatum, absolutum; haec enim omnia de illo vere dicuntur in quo non reperitur forma inherens, que fundare possit hujusmodi denominaciones. Annotavit hoc *Galeianus Parisiensis*, denominaciones passiva sive predicationes sunt in rebus in quibus non sunt, in eis, vel ad eas, vel de ipsis.

Nolo hoc genus denominationis impugnare communia quodam arguento quo aliqui uruntur, nempe quod haec denominatio justi videatur esse eorum quae postulant formam intrinsecam: & mox, potest aliquid dici justum extrinsecum & aliena iustitia. Dr. Dav. de bab. just. c. 27 Selt. 36.

Omnis justus dicitur quidem a iustitia, non ab inherente

necessario, datur imputativa justitia, datur comparientium ut Exe. 16. Dics calamitosus ut de Iac. & Ep. 3. propter causa que sunt in ipsis, ex Chrysost. c. 5. S. 28. S. 29.

pared at Exe. 16. an evill day, or of Jacob, and Ephes. 5. because of those which are done in them, or out of Chrysostome.

Quest. 17. You demand where be finde it to be any branch of the Pelagian heresie to deny Adams posterity to be made formally sinners with Adams sinne imputed to them in the letter and formality of it?

Sir, I suppose you intend not that I must finde your terme formally, and in the letter and formality, enough of that but now, and that if I finde it the Pelagian heresie to deny Adams posterity to be made sinners by Adams sinne imputed to them, it will satisfie your question. For that see Vossius.

Utrisque ut occurrerem ostendi quam vere olim scripti Ume. Lirinen. neminem ante prodigiosum Pelagi discipulum Celestium, reatu pravocationis Adams omne genus humanum negasse adductum. Voss. hist. Pelag. Epist. ad Letitorem.

by the guilt of the sinne of Adam.

The Pelagians did deny Adams sinne to be imputed to posterity.

The Catholiques opinion on the contrary was, The sinne of first Parents to be imputed to all, and the whole posterity to be held with the guilt, and that therefore because Adam sinning we were all in his louers.

In the first men humane nature finned, and by this, no sins hurt humane nature but its owne.

Quest. 18. He must answer who are they that deny Infans dying before they commit actuall sinne, are punished by death, because they are guilty of Adams sinne, or affirmeth that God out of his justice destroyeth innocent babes.

Mr. W. answer is, he heard it by many witnesses of good credit, that heard it from your preaching.

And here you give him to understand that it is one thing to have the guilt of Adams sinne derived upon his posterity, another to have the act of his sinne in the letter

In primis hominibus natura humana peccavit, ac per hoc natura humana nulla nocere peccata nisi sua. Ib. ex August. retor. l. 1. s. 10.

and formality of it imputed to his posterity, so that for such imputation they should be destroyed; the former you grant, the latter you conceive will never be proved.

Dying babes then are innocent in regard of imputation of Adams act; It is nothing but the guilt that is derived, not the act, It is the guilt, not the act. Whether doe you not in this answer deny the imputation of Adams sinne with the Pelagian? and so the orthodox tenet, which is the imputation of Adams sinne? I demand whether sin and guilt be one and the same thing with them? Whether there be not sinne to be imputed, and to be held with the guilt, another and distinct thing: and whether they be not distinguished in Divinity?

You denying the imputation of Adams act, as Bishop did against Mr. Perkins, should have told us (as Bishop Abbot saith to that Popish Bishop) how it is true that the Apostle saith, *That by Adams disobedience we are made sinners. For we should not be made sinners by the disobedience, but for that his disobedience is imputed to us?*

Adam (saith the same Author) bare the person of all mankind, either standing to stand for all, or falling to fall for all, being to beget children according to his image — therefore when he sinned, we all being in his loues (as Bellarmine saith) sinned in him and by him, and his sinne by imputation lieth upon us all.

For (saith Doctor Whitaker) his will was ours, and therefore his transgression is ours: because he is not considered as one man, but as the roote of mankind, in which we all were virtually included, and as Augustine saith, we all were that one man.

For neither should we be held either with any guile or iniquity contraried thereto, unless that act by which Adam violated Gods precept, should be, by imputation, ascribed to us.

Here you see, in the doctrine of this great Divine, is the act and guilt, both, and if these were no more but imputa-

*Peccatum, &
reatus.*

*Peccatum im-
putari, & reatu
teneri.*

See p. 405.

*Ipsius enim voluntas nostra fuit, ejusque igitur transgressio nostra est, quia ille non ut homo unus consideratur, sed ut radix generis humani, in quo omnes inclusi virtute fuimus, utquicunque *Augustinus* ait, omnes eramus unus ille homo. Dr. Whitaker de sig. pec. p. 43. De pec. mer. & remisf. l. 2. c. 10.*

Neque enim aut reatus illo aut iniuritate inde contraria tencremus, nisi ille actus quo Adams Dei preceptum violavit, imputacione nobis adscriberetur. Ad. ib p. 37.

tion of that act, here is enough to cleare Gods justice in destruction of babes.

Quest. 19. How such as deny the imputation of Christ's righteousness (viz. in the letter and formality of it) to believers, doe hereby ascribe as much justification by it to infidels and reprobates as believers themselves: when faith is maintained to be the meanes of bringing men into communion with Christ, and to give him part in that great benefit of Redemption purchased for the world?

Answe. You seem to me to doe so, when as what you give faith notwithstanding, you deny in the former part communication of Christ's righteousness to justification, and our being made just by it communicated, which sheweth what you give to be but in word and tongue, for a colour and shew. Still faith justifieth, not relatively to the object, applying it as an hand, but in a proper sense. Neither doe you make the righteousness of Christ, as the meritorious cause, so that by which, imputed, we are just, just as the Papists, whose confutation you shall meete with after, by our learned Divines.

Quest. 20. and 21. But how can Mr. Walker bold it a mistake to say, that justification and life are promised upon condition of believeng?

For my part, I suppose he may say so in a sound sense. And to your argument, either they are promised absolutely, or on condition of somewhat else, or of believeng, or not promised at all.

1. I answer, They are promised to faith in Christ, that is, faith taking in the righteousness of Christ.

2. It is not made to every faith, not to a meere assent to the revelation, not to your faith of a proper sense (though you call it faith in Christ) when as it doth not as a hand bring home the righteousness of Christ by which I am justified. The faith you speake of infoldeth not the object, but opposeth it in this effect justification. Faith in a proper sense (say you) is imputed, and not the righteousness of Christ.

Neither doth Mr. Walker hang out a flag of defiance to the orthodox; you doe in your whole busynesse. Doctor

Douglas

Douay calling faith a *condition*, taketh it with its object as all the rest you mention, against your sense, whom they oppose as they doe the Papist.

Harken and learne. Junius speaking of the covenant of grace, faith, whose condition is found out of us in Christ, and there he faith, that by that apprehended by faith we are justified, &c.

Faith is wont to be considered two ways, in the Scriptures and amongst the Fathers, properly according to the nature of faith simply, another figuratively, that is, by a metalepsis, and correlatively, as faith apprehendeth the object, &c. in the last sense it is said alone to justify.

Our justification is not with the condition of faith, as faith is an habit in us, but as out of us it apprehendeth Christ.

When as faith is an instrument, it is no wonder if, which is the nature of instruments, the name and office of the thing whose instrument it is, be given unto it.

Christ as to be applied, is the condition of the covenant.

Christ is the object of faith, faith Luther, yea rather in faith Christ himself is present.

Hence Bezaeus. And how is faith imputed to righteousness? not absolutely, but relatively, because faith not alone, but with his crucified object is understood, as an hand which receiveth a treasure given, doth not make rich, but the treasure.

This you account perilous, and preached against in my hearing once, you cannot indur it to be set forth with its object Christ, or it to have the nature of an hand, which yet is an ordinary orthodox expression: and to that of Bezaeus for your hearers sake, I will give you an account of divers. Faith justifieth (faith Luther) because it apprehendeth

Cujus conditio
extra nos in
Christo repe-
ritur. p. 16. &
8. Sect 3.

Fides in Scripturis & apud Patres duobus modis considerari solet, proprio secundum naturam fidei simpliciter; altero figurate, id est, metaleptice & correlative, qua fides apprehendit objectum suum, &c. posteriori dicitur sola justificare. Treteat. p. 85.

Nequidem justificatio nostra est cum conditione fidei, qua fides est habitus in nobis, sed qua extra nos Christum apprehendit. Id. p. 88.

Cum fides instrumentum sit, non mirum est, si quae instrumentorum ratio est nomen & officium rei cuius instrumentum est, ei attribuitur. Id. p. 89.

Qua applican-
dus est condicio
federis. Ib. p.
100. Ad Gal. 6. 4. 2.

Et quomodo ad justitiam imputatur? non absolute, sed relative, cum fides non sola sed cum objecto suo crucifixo intelligitur; quemadmodum manus quae recipit thesaum donatum non ditat, sed thesaurus. But. ad q. 35.

and possesseth this treasure, even Christ present.

I therefore Christ apprehended by faith, and dwelling in the heart of the true Christian, is the true Christian righteousness, for the which God counteth us righteous, and giveth us eternall life.

Ib. Because thou believest in me, saith the Lord, and thy faith layeth hold upon Christ, &c. therefore be thou justified and righteous.

Hinc habemus primum quo sensu justificationem fidei tribuimus, quatenus videlicet ea Christianum amplectitur & applicat. Unde Beq. (in confess. Major art 3. c. 4.) vocat unicum illud instrumentum quo Jesum Christum oblatum apprehendimus, & vas unicum ad eum percipiendum comparatum & post. art. 7 Quum ex Paulo affirmamus nos sola fide, sive gratis, sive fide, sive fine operibus justificari (sunt enim haec synonyma) non est hoc distin perinde accipendum ac si diceremus, fidem esse quandam virtutem que nos in nobis coram Deo justificet; id enim esset fidem substituere in locum Jesu Christi, qui unus est nostra perfecta & integra iustitia. Verum ita loquimur, cum Apostolo, & fide sola nos justificari dicimus eo quod amplectitur eum qui nos justificat, nempe Jesum Christum, quo cum nos unit & copulat, ut simus & iphus & omnium ejus bonorum participes; que quidem nobis imputata prouersus sufficiunt ad hoc ut coram Deo absolvamus & pro justis censuramur. *Cham l. 22. c. 1. Sess. 14.*

is, Jesus Christ, with whom it doth unite and couple us that we may be partakers both of him and all his goods, which indeed being imputed to us altogether suffice to this that we may be absolved before God, and be accounted for just men.

Where he citeth Bell. also laying downe the state of the question, who giveth to Protestants. — Which grace faith by believing receiveth: as when a poore man receiveth an almes cum manu pauper eleemosynam à divite recipit, ea manus recipiens eleemosynam non est ipsa eleemosyna, neque causa efficiens eleemosynæ, neque proper ipsam, sed solum relative concurrexit ad eleemosynam obtinendam, quoniam dare & accipere sunt relata.

of a rich man with his hand, that hand receiving the almes, is not the almes it selfe, nor the efficient cause of the almes, nor for it—but it onely concurreth relatively to obtaine the almes, because to give and receive are relates.

Non male, nisi
relative con-
current esset
phrasis apud
nos inaudita,

Sect. 16. To which report of Bellarmine Chamier noteth, *He doth it not evilly, but that, that phrase, to concurre relatively, is unheard of amongst us.*

It ought rather to be named relatively, that is, so farre forth as faith is considered with its object, as when the Church is said to be founded upon the faith of Peter amongst the Fathers. We have elsewhere evicted the place, to be interpreted of Christ whom Peters faith confessed.

Debuit potius relative nominari, id est, quatenus fides consideratur cum suo obiecto, ut cum dicitur Ecclesia super fidem Petri fundata, apud veretes: nos alias evicimus interpretandum de Christo, quem fides Petri confessata erat. Ib.

Junius, But correlative as they speake, as it apprebendeth the merit of Christ as the hand of a begger doth the almes.

8ed correlative tantum ut loquuntur, quatenus meritum Christi apprehendit, quamvis manus mendici elemosynam. De justif. Sect. 16.

To conclude, that we may expound this metonymy by as evident a similitude as we may; faith is as it were the band, or as the purse appreending the treasure of grace, which God giveth to us in Jesus Christ.

Denique ut metonymiam hanc quam evidenter possumus similiter exponamus; fides est tanquam manus, ut tanquam loculus apprehendens thesaurum gratiae quam Deus nobis exhibet in Christo Iesu. Comment. ad Heb. c. 11.

Peter Martir, *And also faith it selfe, if it be considered as it is our worke, we cannot be justified by it, seeing it is a worke both lame and imperfect, farre worse then be requireth. But we say we are justified by it as we appre hend and apply the promises of God and Christ's righteousness & merits.*

Quin etiam fides ipsa, si qua nostrum opus est consideretur, ea justificari non possamus cum opus sit & mancum & imperfictum, longe deterior quam requirit; sed illa justificari dicimus qua promissio Dei, & Christi justitiam meritaque per ipsam apprehendimus & applicamus. L. de justif. Sect. 8.

We answer, that which we have often elsewhere said, *faith (saith the same Peter Martir) id est quatenus opus est non justificare; id enim habet non ex via aliqua sua sed ex objecto, ex morte enim Christi promissionibus Dei justitia in nos derivatur: ita mendicus recipit elemosynam manu profusa vel cruenta non tamen qua manum habet ita iustum & leprosum—fidem ad hunc usum factam esse & infinitam à Deo.* Ib. Sect. 62. & 71.

Christ, the promises of God, righteousnesse is derived to us. As the begger receiveth an almes with a leprous hand, or that which is bloudy, yet not as he hath an hand so infirme and leprous.— Faith was made and instituted of God to this use.

See Gerhard.
de justif. Sect. 181. p. 658.
Condicio pre-
stata, instru-
mentum.

This Sir is the Protestant tenet, as faith taketh in the object it is a condition, and so it justifieth; rejecting this, you desert them, and joyn with the Papists, and Arminians, who calling faith a condition performed, an instrument: they allow it an instrument in a proper sense as you. Yet adde

Non quasi fides praefita proprie instrumentum har. seu instrumentalis actio, qua si cut manu apprehendimus aut attrahimus re- strumentum nuge, &c. Remonst. ex Cens. c. 10. p. 112.

not as if faith performed were made an instrument properly, or as an instrumentall action, by which as with an hand we apprehend and draw to us remission: those are toyes.

Def. Mr. Wotton
P. 34.
Est hoc una ex
maximiis qui-
bus— Ecclesia
Christi a Judae-
is, Turcis, Pa-
ganis, separan-
tur. de justif. l. 2
c. 1. p. 364.

Neither is there feare of his agreement with Jewes, Pagans, and Mahometans, concurring with him in this (that faith in Christ (as hath beeene said) is the condition of justification.

And if you beleeve Parens, who of this question we dispute faith. This is one of the greatest in which — the Churches of Christ are separated from Jewes, Turkes, and Pagans. Where having laid downe the difference he addeth.

Evangelica vero Ecclesia talen formalem causam justificationis non magis audet op- ponere judicio Dei. (He speaketh of faith not applying Christ for in a relative sense) quam stupam igni. Sed credit se justificari fide, gratis imputata justitia propter Christi me- ritum.

Truly the Protestant Church dareth no more to oppose such a formall cause of justification to the judgement of God, then stubble to the fire: but it believeth she is justified freely by imputed righteousnesse, for the merits of Christ.

Thus have I answered your queries which were no answer but tergiversation, and an argument that they were too hot for you in a direct way to meddle with.

My next taske is to examine your arguments, Mr. Wrs. answer, &c. And here passing the entrance in which there is much very unsavoury, with collaterall impertinencies, which your selfe rightly conceive, are but the crude and indigested chullitions of unnatural beaste and passion; indeed vaine-glorious babbling, deserving rather pity, then examination, or as much as reading.

Mr. G. argu-
ments.

And come to the arguments.

The

The summe of your first argument as you give it, is. Imputation of faith is in a proper sense, because the phrase is so often used in this chapter without alteration or exchange: whereas the imputation of Christ's righteousness hath not the least relife either from sound of words or sight of letter in the Scriptures.

Mr. W. answereth, Tropieall speeches may be often repeated, and are in Scripture, as Jer. 26. v. 3. 13, 19. & Gal. 3. Where faith is used ten times in an improper sense. Therefore often repeating doth not prove a proper acceptation. What say you to this? Forsooth, the conclusion indefinitely taken and in the generall is unquestionably true. What then is become of your argument? and what will helpe you?

You answer, Augustines rule approved by Divines. That a littoral and proper sense in Scripture is still to be preferred where there is no necessity of rejecting it; or substituting an improper sense instead of it. You say, in the places instanced in, there is need of a trope, but not so bere, neither reason nor religion contradicting it.

But Sir you cannot be ignorant but this interpretation of yours is against reason and Religion too in the judgement of all Protestant Divines (except heretofore excepted) improved by many arguments in *Sybrandus* against *Berthius*, through all the Epistles, who calleth it a blasphemous heresie; and witness as many as are for the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and the relative sense; and that faith doth justifie as an instrument taking in the object: to them you must first answer.

Besides, is there not mention of imputation of righteousness as well as imputation of faith? verf. 6, & 11. It cannot be faith in a proper sense, that is but inherent and imperfect righteousness. It may be then the righteousness of Christ.

If Mr. Walker saith so, he is not alone, as before.

Yea, there is ground, seeing by the righteousness of Christ in the word, we are said to be *constituted righteous*, Rom. 5. 19. and where he is said to be made *saints of God*, *righteousness, and we the righteousness of God in him*. For which we have the streme of Protestants against Papists, Arminians and Socinians, as before.

Mr. G.

Is there not ground when as hereby God is declared just in justification? which justice faith in a proper sense, destroyeth, as Mr. *Forbs*, and before, seeing faith in it selfe is to divine judgement but as stubble to fire; needeth a covering, and must be justified as well as the person and other workes. Here is the Advocate with the Father, *Jesus Christ the just*, the just for the unjust. What doe you but not submit to the righteousness of Christ, that which is by faith, and establish a worke, your owne worke, so is faith?

We cleare that place against Papists, as before, so doth *Bellar de justif Calvinae*, as in *Bellarmino*. We answer thus to the Papist.

*I. 2. c. 9. ipsam fidem reputari, to whom Doctor Dav Sed frivola est hac objecio; nam nihil usitatius quam cause applicanti illud tribucere quod proprie & immediate pertinet ad rem applicari: quia igitur fides applicat & apprehendit nobis Christi justitiam, id fidei ipsi tribuitur, quod reapse Christo debetur. p. 371. Parem formar argumentum. Cui fides imputatur ad justitiam is justificatur, non &c. Sed justitia gratia imputata Abraham & cuivis credenti imputatur fides. Ergo, p. 484. &c. 1. Licit fides quia imputatur ad justitiam non sit justitia Christi absolute: est tamen relate, quia justitiam quam in Christo queritur, seu quia justitiam Christi sibi applicat, de qua Apostolus, Rom. 5. 18. Fide justificamur, aut proprie qua qualitas, aut Metonymice qua, &c. non proprie, ergo Metonymice, *Parem Casing. in Luc.**

Ad artic. quart. P. 297. This is one of *Arminius* his arguments, who as he is for the propriety of the words, mentioneth the repetition of the phrase against the figurative sense.

And thus have I before I was aware answered what Mr. *Walker* called your second argument also, to what you mention done elsewhere, there also is the answer; for my part I know no other righteousness than that of the Law or Christ: and if it be righteousness, and not of the Law, I meane our inherent righteousness, it must be Christs who was the end of the Law for righteousness to such as believe.

Finis perficiens, per Tottum complementum. That for which, or the scope of the Law, the fulfilling of it. The Law therefore hath this end, that those that doe the Law, and live rightly should be justified. That end Christ alone attaint. Ita scimus proper quod, vel scopum Legis, etiam cum complementum. Lex ergo hunc habet finem ut facientes Legem & regule viventes justificantur, illum finem solus affequuntur est Christus, & nos affequimur dum sive cum apprehendimus. Ita in Christo exhibetur & prestatur vera justitia quam Lex requirit, modo in cum credamus, ut ait Apostolus, Omni credenti: offert enim quidem justitia omnibus, donatur autem & imputatur solis credentibus. Dr. Tott ad. 1. C. 6, Rom.

ned, and we attain it when as we apprebend him by faith. So in Christ there is given and performed true righteousness which the Law required, so we believe in him, as the Apostle saith, To every one that believeth: for truly righteousness is offered to all, but given and imputed only to be'evers. Where also be faith, nothing imperfect or lame can be called the righteousness of God justifying.

But these things diligently considered manifestly shew what is understood by the word the justice of God. Forsooth that perfect and most high integrity of the humane nature, with which every one is indowed (but it is given to them that believe in him, who is absolutely indowed with this integrity according to the flesh for our sakes, as it shall be afterwards declared.) He is presented before God as the Apostle speaketh, holy, unblamable, and unreprovable. That therefore is said to be the justice of God, not only because

it is the free gift of God, or because God in giving this sheweth himself truly just (that is faishfull and true) but also that it may be opposed to the righteousness of men, or of workes, by which David testifieth no man can be justified.

Sect. 17. But to the second Argument (passing bitter and vaine words not a few) which saith, the scope of the A- Mr. G. p. 66.
postle is to put men by the false way of justification which lies through workes, and to discover the true way, that is to make knowne what they must doe, what be requires of them to justification, and will accept of them instead of the workes of the Law; and that is it which be bere faith is imputed for righteousness. Now faith in the proper and formall signification is that which they must doe, &c. and therfore is faith in a proper sense to be accounted for righteousness.

Against this one exception is, that you contradict your selfe, for the doing you urge is but the way of workes, so that it is not, and yet is the way, it is the true and false way, both Mr. W.

Nihil imperf-
sum aut man-
cum potest dici
justitia Dei ju-
stificans. Id. ib.
373.

Hec autem diligenter considerara mani-
festae dicunt, quid vocabulo justitiae Dei in-
telligarur, perfecta nimurum illa & summa in-
genitus humanae nature, qua quisque dona-
tus est (donatur auctem credentibus in eum,
qui haec integratæ secundum carnem abso-
lutiſſime prædictis est nostri causa ut postea
declarabitur) ficitur coram Deo ἀγαθος,
ἀνυποκριτης, ut loquitur Paulus
Col. 1. 22. id est sanctus, inculpatus & qui
nullius criminis possit postulari. Ea igitur à
Paulo dicitur justitia Dei, non modo quia
gratuitum est Dei donum, aut quia hanc lar-
giendo, Deus se vere iustum (id est, fidelem
ac veracem) praefat, sed etiam ut opponatur
justitiae hominum five ex operibus, qua gesta-
tur David neminem justificari.

P. 67.

To this you answer, that Christ calleth faith a worke, John 6. 29. this is the worke of God, that yee beleve in him whom he bath sent.

To this Ianswer, the words are acknowledged, and that beleeving is a work, receiving and applying is a work, and what is required there; so elsewhere explained, John 1. 12. but deny faith to be Gods way, as a worke in a proper sense, opposed to the righteousnesse of Christ its object as accepted of God for righteousnesse instead of the works of the Law. I doe not, nor can thinke that the meaning of Christ, Gods judgement is according to truth, it were not so if he should account that so which is not, or accept of such an imperfect worke for the righteousnesse of the Law, of which before.

Then a man should be justified by a worke, which is denied by many other plaine Scriptures, your selfe acknowledging it a false way, and the word, *not of works of righteousnesse which we have done*, Tit. 3. 5. of which place Sybrandus answering Bertius your Arminian Prince objecting the same text saith, that speech of the Apostle (*not of works of righteousnesse which we have done*) is most firme: your interpretation then must be false, who also there cite Calvinus (of Papists:) the words at full are these.

Firmissima est
enim illa Apo-
stoli oratio.
Cavillantur in eo quod fides alibi opus
vocatur, atque inde nos perperam operibus
fides opponere. Quasi vero fides quartus
obedientia est Divina voluntatis, suo merito
nobis justitiam conciliat, ac non potius quod
misericordiam Dei amplectendo Christi justi-
tiam ab eo nobis oblatam in evangelii pradi-
catione cordibus nostris obsigner. L. 3. l. 8. c.
18. S. 10.

*At the last when they are weary
of wresting the Scripture they fall to
subtilties and sophisticall arguments.
They cavill upon this, that faith is
in some places called a work, that we
doe wrongfully set faith at contrary to
works. As though forsooth faith in
that it is an obeying of the will of God, doth with her owne de-
serving procure unto us righteousnesse, and not rather because by
embracing the mercy of God, it fealeth to our hearts the righte-
ousnesse of Christ offered to us by him in the preaching of the
Gospel.*

And here though you hold it not meritorious, yet a
worke, and oppose it to the righteousnesse of Christ off-
ered in the Gospel.

The Lord there calleth for faith in the object himselfe, who is the end of the Law for righteousness, as but now: Which the Law not being able to fit us with, we have from Christ. Faith in the relative sense, as Sybr. there both out of Melanthon and Calvine. Hearken to the Homily. 2. Part. serm.
Salv. p. 18. fine.

So that as John the Baptist althoough he were never so vertuous and godly a man, yet in this matter of forgiveness of sinne, he did putt the people from him, and appointed them unto Christ, saying thus unto them, Behold yonder is the Lambe of God which taketh away the sins of the world: even so a great and a godly a virtue as the lively faith is, yet is putteth us from it selfe and remitteth or appointeth us unto Christ, for to have onely by him remission of our sins or justification. So that our faith in Christ faileth unto us as it were thus. It is not I that take away your sins, but it is Christ onely, and to him onely I send you for that purpose.

Faith thus considered, though but as a leaprous and weake hand, may doe the same, so that still you are intangled by your proper sense of faith.

Neither can you escape to say, *by works excluded in means* P. 68. *the merit of works, or what is done with an opinion of deserving justification.*

As if the Apostle onely disputed against their merit or opinion of deserving, we know they deserve not, and must have pardon themselves. The dispute is against them simply as causes, to keepe this crowne on the head of Christ alone, which that leaprous hand faith and act of receiving doth, without opposition to Gods free grace or Christs righteousness; thus faith establisheth grace and the righteousness of Christ to Gods justice, Rom. 3. 24, 25, &c. and the Law to boote, *vers. nro.*

That phrase of faith in a proper sense, *as a worke accepted of God for, and instead of the works of the Law,* is down right the Arminian tenet, & destroyeth as I conceive, the righteousness of Christ, making his doings and sufferings void and vaine; For to what end, if the condition be faith in a proper sense, and that instead of the righteousness of the Law? It is to no use, unless it be said to be a meritorious cause of faith being such a condition, and such acceptation, as Qstn-
redder before.

P. 68.

Mr. Goodw.

2. Treat. p. 47.
48.

Once it destroyeth the justice of God with which it will never stand to accept what is weake and imperfect, sinfull in that respect, for perfect obedience due unto the Law.

Before I goe on, those words are considerable. *Surely to serve, worship, and believe in Jesus Christ or Mediator, are just and lawfull, yet no workes of the morall Law, nor was Adam in his innocency bound unto them?*

To passe that of Adams obligation, which was obedience to what ever the Lord did or should propose unto him, and that though it be not in the Law originally it may be in the Law as it stands, with additions and improvements, as you distinguish.

Give me leave as unsatisfied to propose some questions to you now and to intreat your answer. I freely acknowledge you a learned man, answer satisfactorily, & *eris mihi magnus Apollo.*

1. Whether the second Person in Trinity, Jesus Christ, Gods son, were not from eternity, set and chosen Mediator, God giving us to him for life eternall, by accepting of the same?

2. Whether since the fall that eternall purpose be not revealed, and Christ to be him in whom alone is, and ever was eternall life for his Church, men and Angels?

3. Whether as Mediator be he not to be worshipped? and whether it be not Gods Commandement through the word in all times, as he was made knowne in the same under the notion of an Angel, Gods Sonne, &c. by obedience, faith, hope, love, feare, joy, subjection, prayer, and praise; and now with the observation of the Lords day, our Christian Sabbath to his his honor, and righteousness, Rom. 14.18. his service: and whether these be, or which are, or which not morall?

4. Whether worship and service to God in Jesus Christ be required in the morall Law, such faith, hope, love, feare, joy, obedience, prayer, prayse, or not? and what are the differences; and if, why worship of Christ shall be excluded? Whether worship of God out of Christ be required, or abrogated?

5. Whether if it be not in the morall Law, it falleth under

under the Judicall Law, or Ceremoniall Law, or be a
Counsell, or is the Gospel a Law?

6. It to serve and worship Christ be just, &c. How can
it not fall under the rule of justice, which I take to be the
morall Law?

7. If not, how is that a perfect and exact rule of works
and worship, as Mr. Bradf^b. p.43. *the summe of what is to
be done?*

8. Whether Christ and his *Apostles* ever commanded o-
ther worship. I, or the Prophets then *Moses*?

9. Whether the first Commandement doth not re-
quire worship according to the will of God?

10. Whether those words, *I am the Lord thy God*, pre-
fixed to the Commandements, be not the tenour of Gods
covenant in Christ, to which there must be a suitable an-
swer?

11. Whether any Commandement in the decalogue
hath more requisites of a morall Law, then faith and
worship of Christ as Mediatour?

12. Whether faith being a cause, a roote, a mother of
all good, an especiall requisite to make them good, be not
required in the same Lawes where those workes are

13. Whether faith in the worship of Christ the Media-
tour, be not that same worship and honour that is given
to God the Father and the blessed Spirit? So that both or
neither are morall? And how else is it that the constant
practice of the Churches is in prayer to beginne in the
name of Christ, and to end, *to whom with thee and the Spirit,
be glory?*

I finde it written that *all shoulde honour the Sonne even as
they honour the Father, and that he that honoureth not the Sonne,
honoureth not the Father that sent him, John 5.23.* And, *Ye
believe in God, believe in me also, John 14.1.* And that, *Jesus
cried and said, He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but
on him that sent me, John 12.44.* I finde that in righteou-
ness, the grace and workes of righteousness, Christ is set-
ted, *Rom. 14.18, 18.* I finde that as grace is from God the
Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, *1 Cor. 1.3.* so that the
glory,

glory of it appertaineth to both.

I finde those praised Divines of Leyden, doubting lest the *Kemonstrants* (naming the title of their eleventh Chap. of faith in *Jesus Christ*) would have faith in *Christ* another from faith in *God the Father*, and in the *Holy Ghost*; to which they speake thus.

Nos enim qui unam fidem novimus ex A. post. Eph. 4. v. 5. unum etiam terminum solum Deum agnoscimus; & in Christum credimus quia Deus est, eandem omnino ob causam qua in Patrem: ita ut Christus quatenus in eum credimus, sit cum Patre proprium ac primarium fidei salvificæ objectum. Etsi enim in Symbolo profiteamur distincte nos credere in Patrem, Filium & Spiritum Sanctum, non tamen habemus tres illas distinctas personas pro tribus differentibus salvificæ fidei objectis; sedem tamen fidem deberi Christo ut Prophetæ, Sacerdoti & Regi nostro unicō, non aliam tamen officii & aliam ratione personæ, sed unam & eandem, qua qui recipit Christum, recipit eum qui misit eum, Matth. 10. 40. Ideo dicit Petrus nos per Christum credere Deo qui excitavit eum à mortuis, & gloriam ei dedit ut fides & spes nostra in Deo esset, 1 Pet. 1. 21. quo loco ostendit objectum ultimum seu terminum fidei nostræ Deum esse, & quo Christus distinguuntur non naturæ sed officiis ratione, qua per Filium postremus temporibus nobiscum loquutus est Deus, Heb. 1. 1. — Ubi nullum est discrimen fidei, sed una fides, quæ primum ad Christum directa, proper Christum optima queque de Pace sibi pollicetur, in quem alioquin extra Christum credere ad salutem non possemus, ideo author & consummator fidei nostræ dicitur ab Apost. Heb. 12. 1. Est ergo una fidesqua Patrem & Christum complectitur, quam etiam idem Apostolus ad Heb. 6. 1. appellat fidem in Deum.

fice, as God in the last times spake to us by his Sonne, Heb. 1. 1. — Where there is no difference of faith, but one faith, which first directed to Christ God-man promiseth to it selfe all best things of

of the Father for Christ's sake, in whom otherwise out of Christ we should not believe to salvation; therefore is he called the Author and finisher of our faith by the Apostle, Heb. 12. 1. Therefore there is one faith by which we embrace the Father and Christ, which the same Apostle, Heb. 6. 1. calleth faith in God.

Where also they say, and prove by places brought to that purpose, that the Socinians deny faith in God and Christ to be the same.

That also must be considered, where you say *by works*, (*the false way*) is not meant whatsoever may in any respect be said to be done by a man himselfe, if any thing shoulde be upon any consideration required of him in reference to his justification.

To which I say, it is true in the Protestant sense, taking faith in a Relative sense; I, and of all graces else as Companions, and present with the faith that justifieth, for it is not alone when it justifieth, though it alone justifieth, (as the Learned acknowledge) but then, that any thing but faith as an instrument receiving, should have efficience, that there should be somewhat, any thing, faith it selfe, accepted of God instead of the workes of the Law, to justification, I am afraid to acknowledge. Truely Sir there is more in this first heape then I was aware of at first sight, and I think you must to worke againe.

Another thing Mr. Walker excepteth against, is that you say. *God doth not require of us the righteousnesse of Christ to Justification, this be required of Christ himselfe.* To which you say, *that before Mr. W. sheweth the grossenesse of this error, himselfe drops two grosse errors indeed.*

What is the first? That (*say you*) *God requireth nothing of us to Justification, when as it is notoriously knowne that he threateneth damnation except we believe; and to credit his saying, he cites, Rom. 3. 24. whereas the verse following quite overthrowes it, wherein the condition of faith is expressly mentioned.*

I answer, here is no error if you will understand Mr. Walker, his meaning is, he required no worke or doing of ours for it, it being done freely by grace in Christ, which grace will not stand with our worke.

O

Neither

Parem esse &
dem in Deum &
in Christum.
Cenjura. In cap.
11. p. 154-155.
P. 68.

Neither doth he deny faith required as a condition in a sense, Relatively, or as the hand and instrument receiving Christ's righteousness to justification. He denieth it as our worke, for, or instead of the righteousness of the Law to justification.

When you say, *God threatneth damnation, except we believe,* is it not a sinne? a transgression of the Law? Is it not the Law's to minister death? It seemeth this faith is therefore required in the Law. You goe on.

He (say you) drops a second error more grosse then the former, saying, that *faith is a qualification to us for the receiving, applying, and injoying Christ's righteousness, that is, faith is a qualification to us for believeng; for what is the receiving, applying, and injoying the righteousness of Christ, but believeng at before observed?*

1. Here you see Mr. W. excludes not faith believeng as a qualification, which was your late charge, your selfe discharge him.

2. To say that a man may receive, that is, apply and injoy the righteousness, which receiving is believeng, he must be qualified, is no more then to say, he must have a power that he may doe; be habitually disposed, that he may act, which is so farre from being an error, that it is impossible that a man should believeng, receive, or apply in this kind without faith.

And with your leave Sir, faith in a proper sense qualifieth not, but as instrumentall, as an hand it receiveth and injoyeth, it bringeth home treasure which inricheth; the righteousness of Christ which justifieth. It is so far from opposition to the righteousness of Christ in justification, which is your tenet.

Finally, here is more granted to faith by you, then an affent, or work of the understanding, which is of some use.

But let us returne to what Mr. Walker taxed, that is, You said, *God required not of us the righteousness of Christ for justification;* this (you say) Mr. Walker calls a grosse error, and instead of proofe, complaineth of it as an barre, unsatisfactory,

very, and absurd phrase : and that to justifie his complaint, he saith God requires not the righteousnesse of Christ, but of Christ himselfe, implying he had need.

1. I answer, Mr. Walker in all chargeth you here but with one grosse error, and if that be made good it is enough.

2. It is true, he calleth Gods requiring of us the righteousnesse of Christ for justification, absurd, &c. which he sheweth, and you touch not : see the place.

3. I suppose what you inferre as his proove thereof is not so, nor to that end intended, but a plaine passing to it (as he conceived) a grosse error, and so your jest p. 70. faile, are but irrelativeness and impertinencies.

Before I come to the maine thing (not having your writing, I must speake to it as it is related) What if one should contradict your position, and say, God requires of us the righteousnesse of Christ to justification? you say he requires faith, and *faith in Christ, a believing, whiche is receiving, applying, and injoying*. Why may I not put in the object received, applied, and injoyed, the righteousnesse of Christ to justifie me? Is it not a receiving him, an applying him, and injoying him, to justification and salvation? I hope it is with his righteousnesse. He that threatneth damnation for not receiving, applying, and injoying Christ, requires of me receiving Christ and his righteousnesse also to justification, as he requireth that I be *wist*, and revealeth him our righteousnesse, he requireth applying and receiving him, putting him on for justification; that, or perfectly to performe the Law, which being impossible it is that ; and the Scripture saith that *by the obedience of one I am constituted righteous*, Rom. 5. 19.

But to the businesse. God required not of us the righteousnesse of Christ for justification. This he required of Christ himselfe : so you. This last he calleth an error indeed, There he putteth an Accent. This saith Mr. Wr. implieth Christ had need of justification, and was bound to fulfill the Law for himselfe, and favoureth of Socinian and Samosatenian heresie, which denies Christs Godhead ; for if Christs humane nature being

from the first conception most pure, upright, and holy, was personally united to his Godhead, and so the Sonne of God, and heire of all thingz; Who can doubt but in himselfe he was worthy of all glory, at Gods right hand from his birth: as his taking of our nature upon him, was altogether for us: so his infirmities, sufferings, death, and continuance on earth for the performance of all righteousness and obedience to the whole Law was for us, and for all the elect, who of old beleeved in him to come for them, who doe now beleieve in him exalted to glory according to his humanity. To think or say that he had need to justifie himselfe, and to merit by his righteousness the state of glory, is in effect to deny he was God, infinitely worthy of all glory, as he was the onely begotten Sonne of God and Heire of all thingz. Thus Mr. Walker.

Here we must lay aside Langbings irrelativenesse and impertinencies.

What say you to this? It seemeth a grosse errore by what is said.

I could I conceive (say you) put some Queries to him, that would a little trouble him to make good the truth thereof in a positive way.

You should first answer, then propose Queries. Your answer by Queries is but a wile, tergiversation. I will be plaine in answering you, as I shall be able.

How he can prove that Christ had no need of justification? Surely Christ was a justified or righteous person in the sight of God, then justification was not superfluous, or no wise usefull to him; and what is not superfluous, we men of the lower forme of learning judge to be some wayes needfull.

1. Mr. Walker answereth, if justification be forgiveness and pardon of sinnes only, (as you elsewhere say) when as he is said to have need of justification, he is insoulded a sinner, to have need of remission of sinnes. Which if it be too too grosse, by it may be proved that he needed not justification for himselfe.

Yea, to be in need of forgiveness of sinnes, and so righteous a person as you speake, are pugnansis secum fronsibus aduersis, a contradiction.

But it seemeth as he was a righteous person, that was not superfluous,

1. Quere.
Mr. G.

superfluous, therefore some waies needfull.

You must say for himselfe. But he needed it not for himselfe being Gods Sonne, God blessed for ever, and comprehensor from the first moment of his conception by personall union with the holy Ghost. It was needfull then for us. He was our *Surety*, and in that respect they might be needfull for us, though not for himselfe else.

Being our *Surety*, what was our debt must be paid, it was necessary to our life; our debt was perfect obedience to Gods Law. It was also death, the wages of our sinnes, to free us from death he must die, and he must fulfill the Law, that we may live, by the whole we come to be wholly faire, holy, unreprovable, and unblamable in his sight, compleste.

I conceive our election to salvation was by and in him before the world as our Mediatour and Surety, and we made accepted in him Gods beloved one. That he was verily ordained before the foundation of the world, such, but manifested in the last times (a Lambe without blemish or spot) for us who by him doe believe in God. He was set for our rising, sent to and for us. Raised up an borne of salvation for us, borne to us, given to us. Wherenthe fulnesse of time was come, God sent his Sonne made of a Woman, made under the Law to redeeme us that are under the Law, that we might receive the adoption of sonnes. That his making himselfe of no reputation, taking upon him the forme of a servant, bumbling of himselfe, becomming obedient to death, even the death of, untill the death of the Crosse, was for us. So was his fulfilling all righteousness, and comming to fulfill the Law, his comming to doe Gods will, his alwaies doing things pleasing to God; thus God purposed, thus he obeyed. He was a righteous branch, the Lord our righteousness.

You know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ (saith Saint Paul) that though he was rich, he became poore, that we through his poverty might be made rich, 2 Cor. 8. 9. For their sakes sanctifie I my selfe, that they also may be sanctified.

When as the Scripture sheweth him to be made a *Surety*, it is enough to shew he was not made for himselfe, but for

Likewise in the example of David in the remission of sins the Apostle must needs understand the imputation of righteousness, without the which he can never passe by the gates of Heaven, which are the gates of righteousness, that is, whereat the righteous shall enter. Master Cartwright in Rom. 4. v. 6..

It pleased the Father that in him should all fulnesse dwell, he is the head of the body the Church; yee are compleate in him.

Though therefore it was not usefull to himself for himself, it was not superfluous, he being our Head, our Mediator and Surety; It was most necessary for us. *What the Law could not doe, God sent his Sonne, &c. that the righteousnesse of the Law; whatsoever the Law requireth to justification, might be fulfilled in us.* And thus is he the end of the Law for righteousnesse to every one that believeth, as before out of Doctor Tossius, enough to that question: to the second next, which is,

Quest. 2. How he would prove Christ was not bound to fulfill the righteousnesse of the Law for himselfe.

Mr. Walker told you, you answer him not. I may propose some reasons to your consideration which perswade me so to think.

1. He had no need of forgivenesse of sinnes, neither was he ever forgiven, and so had no need of justification, which consisteth therein as you hold.

2. He did all for us, our need, being our Surety, in that name he was bound, *God spared not his Sonne, exacted it, and our Lord Christ undertooke the worke, and finished the worke.*

3. I read in our learned Writers largely observed.

P. 165. 166.

See Polanus, Symphonica Catol. whose Thesis is.

*Christus pro nobis est incarnatus: pro no- Christ is incarnate for us, he obey-
bis obedivit Patri: pro nobis baptizatus, ed his Father for us, was baptizated,
passus, mortuus, resuscitatus, glorificatus.*

*Christus nihil propter se aut fecit aut pat. suffered, dead, raised, glorified for us;
fus est, sed propter salutem omnium. Primes. which be there proveit by the Fathers.
in Rom. 11.*

And so on Dan. 9.

P. 202. 203.

See Doctor Downham using reasons which are to be an-
swered.

204. De justif. l. 1.

c. 2. Sect. 9. 10.

Ad Gal. c. 4.

p. 184. 2.

Luther. *I could have overcome the Law by my absolute power without mine owne smart, for I am Lord of the Law, and therefore it hath no right over me. But I have made my selfe subject to the Law for your cause which were under the Law, taking your flesh upon me— I suffered the Law to have dominion over*

me which was his Lord — which is ought not to have done.

Because, neither hath Christ righteousness to any other end, then that he may impute it, neither doth he impute any other thing then righteousness, neither is he otherwise our righteousness, then by imputation.

Christ was the Lord of the Law.

He willingly subjected himself, although the Law was not given to him being just and sanctified from the womb.

The end also is shewed by the Apostle, forsooth, that he was not made such for himself, but for us.

Therefore these axioms are to be held. Christ was not made subject to the Law for himself, but for us. And that the whole obedience of Christ is ours, and so imputed to us.

Calvine. That he may admonish us that Christ was not just for himself privately, but that the righteousness which he enjoyed was more large, that he might make rich the faithfull by the gift conferred upon him.

Therefore Christ the Sonne of God, who by right had beene free from all subjection, was subject to the Law, that he might gaine unto us liberty. For as the man that was free, by making himself a captive and Surety, redemeth, and putting on chaines, takeith them off another: so Christ would become a keeper of the Law that he might gaine unto us freedome, otherwise he had in vain undergone the yoke of the Law, seeing certainly he did it not for his owne cause.

Quia nec in alium finem perfectam justitiam Christus haber quam ut imparet, nec aliud imparat quam justitiam, nec aliter justitia nostra est quam per imputationem, *in Tractatus.* p. 82.

Christus Dominus legis fuit. — *Tosser ad Gal. p. 212.*

Sponte se subjecit, licet illi ab utero justo & sanctificato lex posita non esset. *Ib. p. 243*

Finis etiam ostenditur ab Apostolo, quod videlicet non sibi iphi sed nobis talis est factus. *Ib.*

Tenenda igitur sunt haec axioma, Christum non sibi sed nobis factum legi obnoxium: & nostram esse ratione Christi obedientiam, atque adeo nobis imputatam. *Id. ib.*

Quanquam non ponit *Augustinus* sed *Gregorius* Christi, ut admonet ipsum non sibi privatum fuisse justum, sed justitiam quam praeditus fuit, latius patere, ut collato sibi dono, fideles locupletetur. *Calv. in Rom. 5.17.*

Christus ergo Filius Dei, qui immunis iure fuisset ab omni subjectione, Legi fuit subiectus, ut libertatem nobis acquireret. Quemadmodum enim qui liber erat capivum se & vadim constitudo redemit & induendo vincula exxit: Ita Christus Legi servandae obnoxius esse voluit, ut nobis immunitatem acquireret; alioquin frustra jugum Legis subiisset, cum sua cetera causa non fecerit. *Calv. ad Gal. 4.4.*

And

Et proprius obedientiam Filii non debitam, debitum remittit. Ar. in 3. Phil. p 49.

Sed etiam cum non esset proprio Legis debitor in se, neque respectu humanæ naturæ (alias enim proprio identitatem dñs suos logos ipse pro se ad Legis obsequium teneretur, quod in Legis authorem fuit contumeliosum) nec respectu personæ: Sed respectu dispositionis voluntariæ omnitem tamen ex parte Legi satisfecit, ut exuberans infiniti plene meriti plenitudo nobis in Christo parata, &c. *Jan. thes de justif. Sct. 7.*

Sibi non natus sed nobis. Id. Sct. 4. lb.

voluntary disposition he did wholly satisfie the Law, that the overflowing fulnesse of his indeed infinite merit prepared for us in Christ, &c.

He was not borne for himselfe, but us.

*Justitia nostra est sola satisfactio Christi praestita Legi pro nobis & rora humiliantis Christi, &c. quiquid denique fecit & passus est, ad quod ipse tanquam justus & Dei filius non fuit obligatus, est satisfactio ejus quam pro nobis praestitur, & justitia qua nobis credentibus adeo gratis imputatur: ea enim satisfactio equipollit vel impletioni Legis per obedientiam, vel penæ æternæ proper peccata, ad quorum alterutrum Legi obligamus. *U. finis p. 391.**

*Gerbar dat Neo-Pbonianus Christum quidem perfecte impleuisse Legem, sed ad obedientiam illam pro seipso addictum fuisse. *D. justif. p. 463. Sct. 35. & Socino, &c. Sic Chemnit exam. de justif. p. 252.**

*Vise Echardum lsc. Controversi citantem Calvinum. l. 2. c. 17. instit. Sct. 6. *Marsilius in Psal. 4. &c. & Polanus quæst. de obedientia p. 140. & p. 398.**

fulfill the Law for himselfe, by Mr. Deering in his second Lect. on Heb. Christ by his spirit still filled his manhood more and more with grace, till the fulnesse of all righteousness was within him, that so his manhood might inherit salvation according to the promise, Doe this and live.

Whose booke is not in mine hands that I may examine it.

And for the undue obedience of the Sonne he remitteth what is due.

Junius. But also when as he was not properly a debtor of the Law in himselfe, nor in respect of his humane nature, (for otherwise the Word himselfe by reason of the samenesse of the person, should for himselfe be bound to the obedience of the Law, which would be contumelious to the Author of the Law) nor in respect of his person; but yet in respect of his

righteousnesse is onely the satisfaction of Christ performed to the Law for us and the whole, &c. of Christ bumbling himselfe, &c. whatsoever, to conclude, he did and suffered, to which he, as a just man, and the Sonne of God was not bound, is his satisfaction which he performed for us, and righteousness which is freely imputed to us believing by God. For that satisfaction is equal either to the fulfilling of the Law by obedience, or eternall punishment for sinne, to both which we are bound by the Law.

These are enough, they may satisfie you.

You prove Christ was bound to fulfill the Law for himselfe, by Mr. Deering in his second Lect. on Heb. Christ by his spirit still filled his manhood more and more with grace, till the fulnesse of all righteousness was within him, that so his manhood might inherit salvation according to the promise, Doe this and live.

Whose booke is not in mine hands that I may examine it.

Only I say that it is not said that he merited for himselfe by workes of righteousness which he did, but the spirit filled him with grace. For those words *more and more till,* &c. they are not to be justified by me, it is certaine he had the spirit, was annointed with it, not by measure from the moment of conception, by that, and personall union from that moment he had eternall life, and was comprehensor, and did inherit.

When Mr. Bradshaw saith, *Christ was a servant and bound to the Law, not freed by hypostatic union:* He

Yet faith, that state such as be needed not to have undergone, and that the reason was his taking on him to satisfy, &c.

He saith, as Christ was borne of a Woman, not for his owne sake, but for theirs, whose Saviour and Redeemer he is: So being borne of a Woman, he was made under the Law also, not for his owne sake, but for ours; yea, therefore he was borne of a Woman, that so far our sakes he might be under the Law. Also as he became a servant for our sake, so in that very regard he came under the Law of a servant, it being all one to become a servant, and to be made under the Law of a servant, the being under the Law of a servant, &c. All which is in summe, he needed it not for himselfe, but as our Surety, of which before.

You say, *And be tht holds Christ as man, was not bound to fulfill the righteousness of the Law for himself during his continuance on earth in the flesh, must if be be true to his principles, hold withall that Christ as man had a liberty, or dispensation from the Godhead, to transgresse in respect of himselfe, and that his dispensation could not take place or be put in execution only because of the worke of redemption he had undertaken.*

Answ. I answer, that I conceive there is no such need, their principle is hypostatic union, whence he was Comprehensor; I, the Lord of the Law from the first moment: his Union, and his Unction by the holy Ghost, are inconsistent with sinne, as inconsistent with sinne as with his bringing about the worke of redemption undertaken: sinning is inconsistent with soules made perfect, how much more with that person, full of grace, that is glorified

P fully,

There might be more and more powerfull exercise, and external manifestations, not increase in grace simply, but was perfectus vir in ventre, &c. Jer. 1. 6. in Hier. tom. 5. fol. of grace & Christ ab initio beatu extitile. Affectum Patens, Aug. 14 deconsensu Evangel. Leo Ep. 97. c. 3. Ubi testatur divinitatem assumptam humanitatem beatificare, ut glorificari in glorificante permaneat. Sc Salmer. 111. 47. p. 441.

To 3. &c. c. 13

Scilicet 6.

Scilicet 7.

Scilicet 9.

ib.

Scilicet 13.

p. 71.

Mr. G.

Mr. G.
3

fully, the most blessed GOD?

Thirdly, you say, I would put him on this, to prove such an absolute inconsistencie or diametricall opposition as he seemes to imagine betweene Christ's fulfilling the Law for himselfe and for us, as if no band they could stand together.

I answer, to doe for life and glory during his continuance on earth, and to injoy it from the first moment of his conception is vaine: and so inconsistent with nature; absolutely inconsistent with that person which is the most wise God.

Therefore the scope of Christ in obedience must not be himselfe, his life and glory, but us and our life and glory.

Neither doth it follow which you say, if Mr. Walker had in this worke bin scope to discharge bin conscience, and the benefit of others, that Christ's scope in obedience was bin glory as well as man's good; seeing he hath that glory as Comprehensor before his obedience, when as a faithfull Ministers discharge of conscience by a worke of this nature, cannot be but by this worke, when the worke is done, conscience dischargeth it selfe.

When as Bernard saith, *that the worke of our redemption was, opus aequum nostrum ac suum ut angelorum;* there may be truth in it in divers respects. He saith it not with respect to his owne redemption or justification, and so not to your purpose.

You say it would cost him many of his thoughts and much of his learning to give a sufficient and cleare account, how it should any way intrench or so much as looke towards the deniall of Christ's Godhead to conceive that Christ might be bound to fulfill the righteousness of the Law for himselfe.

I answer, for Christ to be bound to fulfill that righteousness, for himselfe his justification as you before, is to imply him a sinner, and so to deny him God.

It is also to imply him vainely busied, living and injoying life eternall being the fountaine thereof, to doe that he may live, and so to deny him to be that fountaine, and to be that person that is God.

Mr. G.

You conceive it is farre more dangerously to shake the truth
of

of his humanity to deny that he was no wiser bound to keep the Law for himself.

I conceive no danger in it, for being absolutely righteous from the first moment, and so not to need obedience or doing for himself, is so far from denying humane nature, that it setteth it forth most glorious: as it doth stand with humane nature to be perfect in glory, though then it worketh not to that end; so doth it in Christ's humane nature, to be perfectly righteous, though he never doth one worke to that end.

And Mr. W. intreateth you to tell him whether you now deny Christ to be true man, when at sitting at God's right hand he is not bound to obey the Law, and dy, as he did on earth? So that it is not to be compared, in the kind, with the errore of the Ubiquitary.

You say, *It is marvellous to me that he being the seed of the Woman, by the Law of his Creation should not be bound to keepe that Law which bath the man and the woman stood bound to keepe in their innocency.*

1. Sir, Wonderfull was one of the names of Christ, it is no wonder if there be many wonders in him.

2. Had he beene sincere man, what you say might follow, being also God, there was never such a man or woman in innocency.

3. Adam and Eve must doe to live, doing was the way to it, but Christ was alive as soone as he was a man, there is difference.

4. He being God-man was eminently just, *Jesus Christ the just*, and if ever that was true of any, which the Apostle speaketh, *The Law is not given to the just, it is tru of him*. By this he was the Lord of the Law, the person was so, and exempted, onely as a Surety, for us he was made under the same.

You say as the personall union with the Godhead could not privilege his humane nature or body against those properties which are naturall and essentiall to it, as localitie, quantity, firmesse, commensurableness to its place, nor communione, nor conveigh over those properties of immunitie, ubiquity, omnipresence,

Mr. G.

sence, &c. which are essentiall to the Divine nature. So neither cou'd it priviledge his manhood against those morall habitudes, relations or conditions which are his essentiall in another way, as videlicet, subjection to God, obligation of serving him, and fulfilling his will, &c.

1. I answer, essentiall properties of man are inseparable.

2. And essentiall properties of God incomunicable.

3. It is not *inquit in hominis oratio*, to speake of man privileged against properties, his priviledges (as you call them) being destructive and inconsistent with his nature.

4. The opinion that Christ did not obey for his owne life from morall habitudes, or relations, or conditions which you call essentiall in another way, subjection to God, obligation of serving him, fulfilling his will: We grant all these, necessary that he might be our Surety, which is that for which he was incarnate, he came to doe Gods will; we say he was so from the instant of conception perfectly, else was he not Comprehensor, and urge that as a reason why he did it not for himselfe, but us. It is one thing to be so, and thence to doe for us according to Gods will, another to doe for that life and glory which he possesteth.

I deny not but God promised him the glory of that work of mediation, and that he wrote with an eye to that, and so prayeth for it as due by Gods eternall compact, John 17, glory there being that which he had with his Father by covenant in doing that worke before the foundation of the world, that is one thing, living on personall doing is another, it was not needfull he should doe for that being his by union in conception.

And I question whether if his obedience was debt, his owne debt, he could merit and satisfie thereby for himselfe or us, seeing debt and merit cannot consist. When man hath done all that he is bound to doe by Gods Law, he must say, and truly, he is an unprofitable servant, it is what he ought, and so not worth thankes at the Creators hands. Which yet you imply, when as before you say Christ's scope in obediency, was bin glory as well as mans good, p. 180, before, and where

where you say in a sense it had an influence. What will become of mans justification by his passive obedience, which is confessed to have absolute necessity of his active to make it a Sacrifice propitiatory, how is it an essentiaall requisite, if due for himselfe?

The doing or suffering is of no force to satisfie whiche is done by bond, though the party offending had committed no fault at all, it being ridiculous to account the payment of one debt for the discharge of another.

Nothing satisfieable but that which theritesh, nothing meriteable but righteousness, which must be by another.

Concerning Christs meriting his exaltation (you say) you will not strive with him for the present, and believe you may both wade deeper and know more then you doe, viz. Rev. 5.12. Heb. 12. 2. Phil. 2. 7, 8, 9. &c. Luke 24. 36. &c.

I answer, I beleive it, for mans knowledge is but in part. It is but a little that we know of him, O that we knew it and could walk more humbly, and so might passe them as not against us.

Only I must put you in minde, that if those places make for your purpose, and in your sense, they prove that the Lord Christ suffered for himselfe as well as for us.

And when we grant the places of the glory of his mediation: It will not follow of glory simply for his humane nature, which certainly he had before.

We come now to another exception that you call *faith a thing done and performed by us, it being the gift of God and motion of his Spirit in us*; in which Mr. Walkers scope is not to accuse you of making believing Gods act, or to deny man the subject thereof: but to note to you, that, the act of man in a proper sense believing, and as our worke, is not the condition of the Covenant, of which before.

And now let us to the bottome of this beape (as you speak) frothy words shall not stay me. Here you are charged to say, that if the Apostle had said they must be justified by Christ, or by the righteousness of Christ, this had bene rather to cast a snare upon them, then to have opened a doore of life and salvation, for which be (Mr. W.) carseth with Anathema maranathas,

natha, the man that proclames it and obstinately mainaines it.

To this you answer, he keepeth back part of your words, and supply them thus. To have said they must be justified by Christ or Christ's righteousness, and will not to have plainly signified what God requireth of them, and will accept at their hand, to give them part and fellowship in that righteousness or justification, had beeene rather to have cast a snare upon them, then to have opened a doore of life and salvation.

I answer, I thinke intimation of that whereby needfull, and that it is done, as where faith and receiving, as the hand and instrument are call'd for; so where the object of that is laid downe, Christ and his obedience, as Rom. 5.19. 2 Cor. 5. 21. so that there is no snare. Let us goe on.

In the next place Mr. W^r. proposeth your first argument reduced, which is,

That the Relative sense fathers upon the Apostle an harsh and uncouth expreſſion often used without explaining himſelfe, when he saith faith is imputed to righteousness, and meaneth Christs righteousness is imputed, which is rather to conceale then reveale it.

To this the answer is.

It is no harsh, strange, or uncouth expreſſion to use a figure of ſpeech, and to meane by faith and beleeving, faith with its object, the righteousness of Christ, or state of the man, &c. which is shewed out of Rom. 2. the fourre laſt verſ. by Beza's interpretation.

To this you reply, *It is true, there are many figures of ſpeech which are no harsh expreſſions. But,*

1. *There are plain & direſt expreſſions which will be made ſtrange and harsh, if men will Metamorphoſe them into Metaphoriſtall and figuratiue, as ſweete wine becomes sharpeſt vinger.*

2. *If men coyme ſuch new formes of ſpeaking, and will call them figures, they may well be ſtrange and harsh expreſſions.*

I answer, It is not altogether what men will doe, though what ſuch and ſo many men doe, as doe this, is not to be despised by you, but what the blye Graft doth, interpreted by Scriptures, as is shewed.

And as for that *Jure on thofe that call it Metaphoriſtall*

*Arg. 1.
Sect. 18.*

Answe.

Mr. G.

Answe.

lepticall, it might have beeene forborene. It is the practise of more then Mr. W^r. divines not to be contemned by Mr. G.

When faith is said to be imputed, faith *V. simus*; *It is a figurative kind of predication, and nametb it Metalepsis.*

I observe it in *Lucas Treleatius*, *Faith in the Scriptures and amongst the Faibers it want to be considered two wayes, properly according to the nature of faith simply; another, figuratively, that is, Metaleptically, and correlativey, because faith apprebends its object.* So doth he, answering *Romanists*.

To an objection of *Arminius*, Doctor *Prideaux* his answer is.

We doe not properly give justification to faith, but by a figure called Metalepsis, so farre forth as the all of the object, because of the neare connexion betweene it and the habit by a usuall phrase of Scripture is given to the habit. Note that we and by an usuall phrase of Scripture.

Sir, all Protestants are for a figure, and these name it a *Metalepsis*, they deserve better language then to be called *Metamorphosers and coyners of figures, users of Metaleptique style elsewhere, and of it as a faire pinborste*, p. 82. Mr. W^r. needeth not be ashamed of using it, but you rather; but (it may be) you knew not who used it. Now to a second exception.

Which is that your deniall of this figurative speech used in the Apostle is false.

This Mr. *Walker* might well doe, having proved it out of *Rom. 2.* the foure last verses, untill you disprove him; neither will that stand for an answer, that the Scripture he citeth stands in the *utmost corner of one only chapter*, much lesse the calling his worke *non-sensicall figuring and misfiguring*. When you send your Reader to what is done, let it be a bargaine, and let him take in Mr. W. p. 255.

A third exception is, that you say the *Apostle useth the phrase of faith, &c. without either explaining himselfe or changing*

Figuratiū genus
predicationis,
per Metalepsin
p. 404.

Fides in Scripturis & apud Patres, duobus modis considerari soler, proprie secundum naturam fidei simpliciter; altero figurate, id est Metaleptice & correlative, quia hedes apprehendit obiectum suum. p. 85.

Nos non proprie justificationem fidei attribuere, sed Metaleptice quacunq[ue] obiectus propter arctam connexionem inter illum & habitum, uisitata Scripturæ phras in habitum transfertur. De justif. p. 170.

ging his speech, which Mr. W. sheweth to be otherwise, v. 6. and 11. where it is said that God imputeth righteousness, and that righteousness is imputed, as it is called faith, ver. 3. and 5. in these places, righteousness; in the former using a figurative, and in the latter a proper speech.

Neither can he by righteousness imputed meane faith in a proper sense, it is not righteousness, or if what is imperfect, on which ground the learned reject that, and call it figurative, comprehending the righteousness of Christ which is used twice, and is righteousness indeed as Mr. W. sheweth at large *Socinianisme*.

P. 190.

P. 78.

Mr. G.

When as you admit that by righteousness in these places the Apostle meaneth faith: You will us to see what a faire market Mr. Walker hath brought his Hoggess to. Let me (passing your Rhetorique) demand what is the market?

You say the sense must be, when God imputeth righteousness to a man that believeth, that God imputeth faith to him that believeth, which is to obscure what was said before.

To this Mr. W. answereth, that it is a Pigge of your owne Sow, you are owner and driver to the market, and leaveth you to looke to it.

What you have done, as you say before, hath answer. The rest may be retorted on you, whose the argument was, who gave him the charge.

Sect. 19.

Come we now to your second Argument.

That faith which is imputed is his before imputation, which cannot be said of the righteousness of Christ, that it is a mans before it be imputed, at least in order of nature, though not in time; therefore by faith to be imputed cannot be meant the righteousness of Christ.

To this Mr. W. that Christs righteousness is as truly his as his faith. You reply here you are friends in earnest, you grant the righteousness of Christ the believers, but that is not the question. What is it then? Whether it be his in such manner as it was Christ himself? that is, whether we be made righteous with it as Christ was, whether not only for it and not with it?

I answer, there is no such question proposed in this place,

place, neither did Mr. Walker, when he saith we are justified by the righteousness of Christ, say it is his that is justified in such a manner as it is Christ's: nor that we are made just with it as Christ was, and yet he may well say we are made just, not only for it, but with it.

The righteousness of Christ is that robe in the Prophet, that garment of salvation, with which the Church as a Bride is arrayed, whence white as Snow, whiter: Wholly faire in his beauty, as Jacob in Esau's apparel to Isaac, as Calvin before out of Ambrose.

And if you compare it to many, it is that by which we are rich, by his poverty, all that he did or suffered in his humble estate, we are made rich, as the Apostle. He is the treasure, faith indeed applyeth him, but it is he that maketh rich. Take the learned Doctors answer if you please, and let him determine this question.

We are alike just, because with the same righteousness, though not equality, and in the same manner: he as the subject of it, we by imputation, he of his own, we of his liberty.

Aque justi sumus ac Christus, quia eadem justitia, nec non aequaliter & eodem modo: ille subjective, nos imputative, ille de proprio, nos de illius largitate. De justif. Doctor Prid. p. 171.

If you regard the truth of imputed righteousness, we are accounted no less just before God than Christ; and that, that is the money and clothing too, we shall shew at large alone.

But Mr. Walker, say you, to prove the righteousness of Christ to be the believers as well as faith is his, mis-cites two Scriptures, 1 Cor. 1.30. 2 Cor. 5.21. Christ is said in the first to be made unto us righteousness, but this proves not that the righteousness of Christ is made ours, as faith is, &c.

1. I answer, that as faith is an adding to what Mr. W. spake, not spoken by him.

2. That the righteousness of Christ is ours, you granted but now, saying, before we be friends to earnest. It is a received conclusion.

Neither ought it to seem absurd that we are justified with that righteousness which is in him as the subject, as another. When

Neque vero absurdum videri debet nos justitia illa quæ Christi subjective tanquam aliena iustificari, cum ita sit aliena ut etiam nostra sit imputatione, pro nobis enim proprie prælita, & a Deo tanquam nostra accepta, quemadmodum fiduciæforis pro debitor solutionum periende recipit creditor ac si debitor ipse eam fecisset; & quod est proprium capituli nostri Christi, jure communionis reliquo corpori id est Ecclesiæ & singulis numeris tribuitur.

as it is so another, that it is also ours by imputation. It was performed for us properly, and accepted of God at ours, as the Creditor so receiveth the payment of the Surety for the Debtor, as if the Debtor himself had made it. And that which is the property of our Head Christ, by right of communion is given to the rest of the body, that is, the Church.

When God giveth Christ, he giveth his righteousness, we receive both by faith, and so both are ours, and therefore is he called the Lord our righteousness. The righteousness of Christ is truly ours, though it be not in us: where he proveth the same. See him, p.50. & 51. where speaking of righteousness imputed, he saith, *nec minus nostram est quam si corporibus & animabus nostris adbareretur*, it is no less ours then if it did adhere to our bodies and soules, Olev.

3. For the texts themselves, hearken to some, of whom you say they are on your part; they from them shew the righteousness of Christ ours to justification.

Calv. on the words, *he was made unto us righteousness*, faith:

Quo intelligit nos ejus nomine accepimus a Deo, quia morte sua peccata nostra expiavit; & ejus obediens nobis in justitiam imputetur.

In which he understandeth us accepted of God in his name, because he expiated our finnes by his death, and that his obedience might be imputed to us for righteousness.

Though Christ and his righteousness differ, Christ's righteousness is ours by imputation in Calvins judgement.

Justitia nobis a Deo factus, quia in eo solo justi habemus: reputamus illius merito justi, *Artius in locum.*

Ex quidem justitia (said Tostatus) non ex parte sed tota nostra justitia, per remissionem peccatorum & imputationem totius sui iustitiae, sic *Mt. 23. p. 19.*

He is made unto us of God righteousness, because in him alone we are accounted righteous, we are reported just by his merit.

And truly righteousness not in part, but our whole righteousness, by remission of finnes and imputation of his whole righteousness.

Righ^teou^sneſſe, that iſ ou^r. Juſtice, hoc eſt juſtificator noſter, donan-
ſier, beſtowing on uſ us true righ^teou^sneſſe nos vera juſtitia coram Deo per fidem,
before God by faib^z, which iſ ſo not formally, that iſ, inde-
reſonably, as Parens speaketh, but by imputation.

¶ Abraham iſ juſtified not with Abraham juſtificatus eſt non inherente,
inherent, but imputed righ^teouſneſſe ſed imputata juſtitia per fidem,
by faith.

To that text, 2 Cor. 5. Calvine.
Now he more plainly teacheth what
we touched before, that then God iſ
propitious to uſ us when he acknowledg-
geth uſ us juſt, for thoſe two are of the
ſame force, that we are accepted of
God, and reputed juſt by him. Righ^teouſneſſe iſ here taken
for imputation, because Chriſts righ^teouſneſſe iſ accounted
to uſ us.

And in that place, to the question, How are we juſt be-
fore God? He anſwereth. Forſooth we are now ſo juſt in him, not becauſe
by our owne workeſ we may ſatisfie the judgement of God, but becauſe we ha-
accounted the righ^teouſneſſe of Chriſt,
which we put on by faib^z, that it may be ours. Aretius on thoſe
words, that we might be made the righ^teouſneſſe of God.

That we may be pronounced juſt, that we might be adorned with im-
puted righ^teouſneſſe, as it were with a garment: but it iſ called the juſtitia of
God, because it is not ouſi, but his free gift. In him, be ſignifieth, that out of
Chriſt there iſ no righ^teouſneſſe with which we may adorn ouſeſelves, and which may be offered in the ſight of God.

That we may be made, that iſ, that we may be juſtified not with inherent righ^teouſneſſe, but in him, because of the commu-
nione, ſed in eo, proper communionem quam habemus cum illo, & imputationem eis-
ſe juſtitia. In deum. Summa loci efficiſſimus juſti heat Chriſtus peccator: at Chriſtus eſt
peccator imputatione noſtrorum peccatorum, non reali corruptione, aut aſtronibus
pravis: ergo noſ imputatione eis juſtitia ſumus juſti, &c. Olcv. in Phil. 3. 9. p. 46. Sic
Gerhard. de juſtif. L. 6. 61.

Justitia, hoc eſt juſtificator noſter, donan-
ſier, nos vera juſtitia coram Deo per fidem,

Partim.

Jam apertius docet quod ſuſta antiguas, tunc Deum nobis eſt proprium quum pro
juſtis agnosci, perinde enim valent haec duo,
eſte noſ Deo acceptos, & juſtos ab ipſo repa-
rati. Juſtitia hic pro imputatione accipitur,
eo quod accepta nobis ſettur Chriſti ju-
ſtitia.

Righ^teouſneſſe iſ here taken
for imputation, because Chriſts righ^teouſneſſe iſ accounted
to uſ us.

Quomodo juſti ſumus coram Deo? &c.
Ita ſc. nunc juſti ſumus in ipſo, non quia o-
peribus propriis ſatisfaciamus iudicio Dei,
ſed quoniam conſememus juſtitia Chriſti, quam
hinc induimus ut noſtra fieri. Calv.

Hoc eſt juſti pronunciareſſur, imputativa ju-
ſtitia tanquam veste ornareſſur, dicitur autem
juſtitia, quia noſtra non eit ſed precario. In
ipſo, ſignificat extra Chriſtum nullam eſt ju-
ſtitia qua noſ poſſim⁹ ornare & que valeat
in conſpectu Dei. Ib. Aret. in loc.

Utnos efficie-
runt, ſaib^z Toff.
hoc eſt juſtifi-
careſſur, non
juſtitia iphe-
neſſur, ſed in eo, proper
communionem quam habemus cum illo, & imputationem eis-
ſe juſtitia. In deum. Summa loci efficiſſimus juſti heat Chriſtus peccator: at Chriſtus eſt
peccator imputatione noſtrorum peccatorum, non reali corruptione, aut aſtronibus
pravis: ergo noſ imputatione eis juſtitia ſumus juſti, &c. Olcv. in Phil. 3. 9. p. 46. Sic
Gerhard. de juſtif. L. 6. 61.

union we have with him, and the imputation of his righteousness.

Justi, sicut *Bez*, apud Deum non quidem iustitia nobis inherente, sed quae cum in Christo sit, nobis per fidem à Deo imputatur: Ideo additum est, in eo Sic ergo sumus iustitia Dei in ipso, ut ille peccatum in nobis, ex imputatione. *Ber. in locum.*

We be just with God, not indeed with righteousness inheriting in us, but which, when it is in Christ is imputed to us from God by faith: therefore it is added, in him. Therefore we are for the righteousness of God in him, as he is sinne in us, forsooth by imputation.

So that in this you oppose not Mr. *Walker* alone, but the word and interpretation of our learned Authors.

Secondly, he answers (say you) that this righteousness of Christ is the Believers, in order of nature, before it be counted or imputed for righteousness unto him. For God, whose judgement is according to truth, doth not account that to the believer which he bath not before communicated, or at the same time doth communicate to him. Well, what of this? you say, He beggs the question that God doth impute the righteousness of Christ to a believer in his sense.

I answer, we are past begging now, and when your sense appeareth, it will be, and is found, Arminian, Socinian, and Pontifical, as shall be seene anone, and Mr. *Walker* the sense of all Protestant Divines against them.

You say *de proposito idem per idem*. I answer no, he progetteth the righteousness of Christ the believers from the truth of Gods judgement; whence he doth not account that to the believer which he hath not before, or at the same time communicateth to him.

To your descant on his words, before, all I will say is, there is added or at the sametime.

If it be true at the same time, it is enough to evade the inconveniences, which arise from its being before, and you should have taken notice of this, or. And now to the third Argument.

The third Argument was, granting a *Trope*, yet it followeth not that the righteousness of Christ should be imputed here, but God or the promise made to Abraham.

I answer, the Apostle calleth it *righteousness*, verf. 6. and verf. 7.

I.
Mr. G.
Answ.

2.

3.

3. Arg. Sec.
20.

verf. 11. as before. Neither do you disprove it, by saying God or the promise, you wilfully oppose Christ's righteousness, God and the promise.

Is not God Abraham in Christ, and so Abraham's faith in Christ supposed to his faith in God? 1 Pet. 1. 23. *We by him do believe in God.* Is not the promise of Gods being Abraham's God in Christ, to whom it is first made, and in whom it is *Ies and Aman*, to Abraham and his seed? The Apostle saith, *If we be Christ's, we be Abrahams seed, and Heires according to promise,* so Abram and believers are Heires in the Heire, by being Christ's, and so the promises containing our inheritance, are ours. Hence amongst the rest we are *Heires of the righteousness which is by faith.*

Sir, in that promise you might have seene the seede, the seede is Christ, and in the promise, his natures, offices, adaptations, doing, dying, rising, sitting at Gods right hand, our salvation, our justification by his righteousness. *Abraham by faith saw his day and rejoyced:* saw all these by faith. So did Abel, his sacrifice witnessed he was righteous, accepted in the righteousness of Christ, and so his sacrifice. So did Enoch please God, which is impossible without faith in Christ, is when God is well pleased. So did Noah, and hence was he just before God, an Heire of the righteousness which is by faith. So did Abram believe in Christ, and it was counted to him for righteousness. Sq David, the

The Prophets after spake him a righteous branch, and the Lord our righteousness.

The Apostle more plainly as before, the promise was the Seed, and blessedness, and we are blessed with all in Christ, they are the inheritance of believers in and by Christ the Heire.

Oletian hath passages this way observable. Having said, *seeing God is just, he imputeth not sinnes, because he imputeth the righteousness of his Sonne.* Hempsch.

David did therefore build on the Sacrifice and intercession of the highest and eternall Priest, whom he spoke by the holy Ghost. There was a Priest for men, this David so David believed, not in righteousness inheriting in himself, but in that

Nitebatur igitur David Sacrifício & instru-
ctione summi & eterni sacerdotis, de quo
per Spiritum sanctum loquuntur eis, Tu es
Sacerdos in aeternum, &c. Arque in David non
in inherenter in se iustitiam, sed imputa-
tam à summo Sacerdote Christo credidit. Sic
Abraham non in se quæsi viti jutitiam, sed fide
extra se vidit diem Christi & gavisus est: dict
autem non solum tempus dispensatio is gra-
tia Christi significat, sed totum beneficium
tum demum exhibuit cum venit plenaria
do temporis. P. 48. ad Phil.

Ideo inscriptio illa sacerdotis in tante Abra-
ham signum iustitiae fidei appellatur, propte-
reia quod Abraham ex semetipso utpote cor-
ruptio & injusto egredius, fide in promissio
semine iustitiam possederat; cique in pra-
putio credenti imputata fuerat: nunc autem
impresso sigillo rei extra ipsum posita & e-
minus conspectus fuit in carne ipius confi-
mata posseditio. Ib. p. 50.

believing in Uncircumcision: But now the possession was confir-
med by an imprinted Seal in his flesh of a thing placed out of
himself, and scarce afar off.

Creditit Abraham ut ille quid credit? Hoc sc. semen sibi dandum est, unicunq;
illud, ut Paulus interpretatur, in quo omnes
nationes essent benedicendæ, quod est Christus
Iesus. Gen. 15. 6. Gal. 3. 16. L. Com. de
just. Scil. 23.

Sed etiam spir-
ituall per Chri-
stum caput sc.
minis, ex quo
in totum semen
benedictio & gloria celestis fuerit definita. A postquam enim promissio semen expressa dicit
est Christum; nec dubitari potest, scimus promissionem cui creditisse Abraham dicimus,
coherente cum promissionibus antegressis & subsequenis de semine & benedictione omni-
um generum per illud. Fuit igitur Abraham fides generalis quædam seu Catholica (ut vo-
lent sophistæ) attentionem omni regno Dei: sed & speciales promissioni data de semine,
quod est Christus. Ita: Ambigunt in Cœlestib[us] Abraham Deo. Quid creditur? sc.
men se habiturumque ab eum quæ causas genere habiliarentur. In Christo igitur fuit fun-
data Abraham fides. Ad Rom. 4. ad vers. 3. p. 263.

which was imposed from the High
Priest, Christ. So Abraham sought not
righteousness in himself, but by faith out
of himself, he saw the day of Christ,
and rejoiced. The day signifies, not
only the time of the dispensation of the
grace of Christ, but the whole bene-
fit then at length exhibited, when the
fullness of time came.

Therefore that inscription of the
Covenant in the flesh of Abraham,
(Circumcision) is called the Seal of
the righteousness of faith, because Abra-
ham going out of himself, as a
corrupt and unjust man, had possessed
righteousness by faith in the promis-
sed seed, and it was imposed to him

Abraham believed, saith Pet. Mar-
tyr. But what did he believe? Forsooth
this seed to be given unto him, that one
seed, as Paul interpreth it, in whom all
the Nations of the earth were to be
blessed, which is Jesus Christ. h. 1. l. 1.

Amongst other things Abraham believed. Petrus addeth,
But also of that which was spirituall, by Christ the Head of
the seed, from whom the blessing and heavenly glory should flow
unto the whole seed. For the Apostle expressly saith the promised

fied to be Christ. Neither can it be denied but the promise of the seed which Abraham is said to believe, so agrees with the promises going before, and following of the seed and blessing of all Nations by it: therefore the faith of Abraham was indeed generall or Catholicque (as the Sepulchreans call it) assenting to every word of God, but also speciall to the promise given of the seed, which is Christ. So Ambrose in his commentary. Abraham believed God, What did he believe? that he should have seed, that is, a Sonne in whom all Nation should be blessed. Therefore Abrahams faith is founded in Christ.

And here may you be well minded of your Doctrine, that the object of the faith, that is imputed, is Jesus Christ, and that it bringeth into communion and participation of him and his benefits; which being true, how could Christ and his righteousness be excluded?

But now to your tedious discourse following involved in many vaine words, which I will not touch.

1. You complaine of his friend Melalpiss, which you doe but play with, to which having seriously answered before, I say no more.

2. Then you demand, whether because a man cannot, believing, separate the righteousness of Christ from Christ, by God there must be necessarily understood the righteousness of Christ.

To which I answer, you doe but triffe, Believing infoldeth God his in Christ, Christ and what ever is lase up in that word Blessednesse; temporall, spirituall, eternall, with Jesus Christ: visiting, redeeming, raising up Christ an borne of salvation, salvation from evill, righteousness and eternall life, are the mercies promised to Abraham, Gods holy covenant and his oath, in Zacharies song. There is more in it then I suppose you are aware of, as if you had but trifled in earnest.

You marshall why Mr. W. still mentions the satisfaction of Christ with the righteousness of Christ. Whereas you intend no difference or dispute about the satisfaction of Christ but his active obedience to the Law. Whether this be imputed that whereby we may claime Heaven, by Doe this and live. And that his

thinking it of the Passive obedience or satisfaction is to present youodium as an enemy to Christ's satisfaction.

1. I answer, Sir, we must chie you mercy, or else wonder as you, why you had not opened this before this time.

2. It seemes you art then for the imputation of Christ's Passive obedience to obtaine pardon, and then Passive righteousnesse is that which is imputed, and faith in a Relative sense to that. And what is become of your proper sense then?

This Mr. Wotton blameth in Piscator, Yet I nowhere finde

Tamen nusquam in sacris litteris reperio in holy Scripture that there is need of imputatione passive Christi obedientie ad can consequendam opus esse, licet verum & perspicuum sit, illas perpettiones (ex Dei decreto) suisse necessarias ad venientem nobis imputrandam. Neque (ut vere dicant quod res est) intelligere possum quis venit relatus sit locus, si (panes in Christo perfervendo) Irz divine satisfactio & supplicium peccatis debitum, periculis existimatur, say what the thing is can I understand nam pena & venia adversa sunt. Manuscr. what place is left to pardon, if we acceptio Jan. 13. 1613. sc. Mr. Wotton.

Should be judged by suffering punishment in Christ, to have satisfied Divine wrath, and borne punishment due to Justice for pardon and punishment are adversaries. Tell us by your next whether and how farre Magister fit hic tenet.

3. Mr. Walker findeth our debt to the Law to be not only death for sinne, but doing that we may live, and we thinke both must have satisfaction, and are inseparabile, and if Christ be the object, why shall his righteousness be excluded? Is he not exalted the Lord our righteousness? Is not the Earth being inconstant and all the returne thereby the issue of Christ and his righteousness? Is not the new Testament confirmed in his blood? are we not by his alliance constituted righteous? Is it not by the righteousness of one that the free gift cometh upon all the justification of life? The Apostle saith, that the promise to Abraham that he should be the Heire of the world, was not through the Law, but through the righteousness of faith, Rom. 4. 13, that is the righteousness

nesse of Christ which faith layeth hold on and applieth, by that the promise was made. And why shall we not thinke his faith then built on that righteousness? You will not question but we have all for Christ's sake, his righteousness sake and merit, they must be imputed, and we by faith have fellowship with them, or never have benefit.

4. Mr. Walker doth thinke Christ's Passive righteousness to be obedience to the Law, that which the Law exacted of us, and we being insolvent of our Surety, and that you cannot escape by calling it satisfaction to God, not to the Law, seeing it was God's Law; and in satisfying God his Law must be satisfied.

To your demand. Doth it follow (though a man cannot separate the righteousness of Christ from Christ himselfe in believing) that the righteousness of Christ must needs be the object of faith at justifying? And adde, much lesse doth it follow that this righteousness of Christ must needs be signified by this word God, or by the promise of God concerning Christ, which himselfe granteth to have beene the object of faith, at justifying.

I answer, it is suitable to reason to pitch on the righteousness of Christ in matter of justification, seeing without righteousness there is no justification, and by righteousness, what ever it be, there must be justification, of which before. The rest hath a full answer as I suppose also. There are other reasons besides inseparableness.

For what is remaining in your owne words, I must say that they are of that manifest inconsequence and indigestednesse, that I will rather trust the Reader with his owne apprehensions concerning them, then to trouble him or my selfe with a farther answer.

The righteousness of Christ can in no tolerable construction be called that faith by which Abraham believed in God that quickened the dead, therefore the righteousness of Christ is not that faith which is here said to be imputed for righteousness. He addle the first proposition, that faith which is said to be imputed to Abraham for righteousness is that faith by which he believed in God that quickened the dead. This (you say) is your next argument whereby you provoketh the Word, that faith is the paf-

P. 44

A 2. 4. 5. 1. 2. 1.

sages is not meant the Active obedience of Christ.

1. I answer, first, in this expressure added, you change the conclusion. It was never Mr. Walker's meaning by faiths object to stand on, alone, *Christ's Active obedience*, but both Active and Passive obedience.

2. When you exclude this, it seemeth you allow that which is Passive to be the object. So that faith may be in that and *bim that quickneth the dead*; the other inseparable part must not be excluded.

3. I answer, it is faith in Christ and his perfect righteousness whereby we believe in *bim that quickneth the dead*, by faith in Christ I believe in God, *he is my God at Abraham*, by which our Lord proveth the resurrection, Matth. 22. against the Sadducees, it reacheth that blessing, by faith in Christ, *Abraham saw Christ's resurrection*, and so his owne, as David did the resurrection of Christ, *Act. 2. 30. at God's oath to him*, which was the same he swore to Abraham. Yea, he saw and believed his owne resurrection; indeed lapt up in Christ's resurrection, as of a member in the raised head, and rejoiced at it, 16. Psal. fine, compare the places.

The Apostle saith *the spirit is life because of righteousness*, Rom. 8. 10. which life is without question (though I exclude not life simply) *the quickning of the dead*, as in the next, v. by righteousness, I take imputed righteousness meant; and, *Cosmier calleth it the very same we call imputed*; and for that quickning of the dead, see the same Cham. out of Tolet, and Cajetan calleth *it the righteousness of Christ*.

Neither is there opposition here, but subordination, betweene Christ and God and life and faith in Christ and his righteousness.

Neither are these effects of two faiths, faiths of a different kind, but of the same, there is *but one faith*, by which, as I believe in Christ and his righteousness, so in God, as he is in Christ for blessedness simply, the remission of sinnes, the resurrection of the body, and everlasting life; the naming of one excludeth not, but necessarily implyeth all the rest.

And though Mr. Walker (as you conceive) *Reads not Christ's lying three dayes and three nights in the grave, anywhere called*

Manc ipsam
quam nos ase-
rimus imputa-
tam, Cham. de
just. c. 2. Sctt.
59 c. 15. Sctt.
36.
Sctt. 37.

called faith, or signified by that expression, yet I suppose I read the *Gospel* to be called faith, and if that you mention be *Gospel*, it must be called faith, Infolded under that expression. I am sure faith by which I believe remission of sinnes, resurrection of the body, and everlasting life, to be faith in God through Christ satisfying, obedient ~~ever un-~~
till death, continuing Gods set time in the state of the dead, for us, our justification and pardon, yea, salvation, to the glory not onely of free grace, but exact justice, and doe you consider the same.

Abrahams faith imputed to him, was such a faith whereby he was not weake, nor doubted of Gods promise, vers. 19. & 20. Arg. 5. Sect. 22.
This can be no description of Christs righteousness.

I answer, though this be no description of the righteousness of Christ, yet Abrahams faith imputed might be a strong faith in the righteousness of Christ, and this makes nothing against the Relative consideration of faith: what ever the degree of faith is, the object is the same, nay the stronger the faith is, the more is a man united to Christ, the greater is his communion with Christ and fellowship with God, and so is his hold fast of righteousness, and so his peace and comfort. So that this hindereth not, but righteousness under the notion of faith, may be imputed.

When you say the question is not whether Abraham had communion with Christ in his righteousness or no, either more full or lesse full; but whether what is here affirmed of Abrahams faith, can be applied to the righteousness of Christ, and be conceived as spoken of that.

I answer, it can be applyed to the righteousness of Christ, and thence Abrahams communion with Christ in his righteousness, in that full manner faith being so full and strong.

When you demand, Was that faith whereby Abraham doubted not of Gods promise, the righteousness of Christ? p. 85.

I answer, it was the same faith by which he apprehended the righteousness of Christ, by which hee beleaved the promise, and in God: What was that promise of but the

the seed, Christ and his righteousness and blessedness in and by the same?

You say your Antagonist starteth a new question, you remember not you ever met withall from the Pen or mouth of any Divine, viz. Degrees in Justification, as if he held because Abrahams faith was stronger, it had fuller communion with Christ in his righteousness than other believers have, and so must needs be more justified, and consequently others justification imperfect.

1. Then there is somewhat you never heard of. I have betweene two famous and godly Divines in my time, though I approve not that Justification hath degrees. It is none of Mr. Walkers, there may be, and are degrees of union and communion with Christ, and so of faith, by which neither of these I suppose are here perfect. It followeth not of Justification or righteousness, seeing every one is perfected for ever, wholly faire, compleate. Mr. Walkers aime is no more then this, that he more strongly applied it, that his apprehension was stronger, and that he had more sensible communion with him in his righteousness. Mr. Calv. on those words, Rom. 1.27. unto faith faith, because so much at our faith goeth forward, and so much at in this knowledge it profiteth, the righteousness of God together increaseth in us, and after a manner its possession is established. Let the last phrase explaine the first, that of increasing, and what is said in my poor opinion is safe.

This your argument I read urged by that Prince of the Arminian band, Bertius, p. 135. where it is answered by Lubberius.

Faith imputed to Abraham was that by which he was assured that he who had promised was able also to doe it; vers. 21 & 22. But Christs righteousness is not capable of any such description as this is, therefore it is not imputed.

I answer, though Christs righteousness be not capable of such description, that by it Abraham was fully assured, yet faith which apprehended the righteousness of Christ, was, it seemeth it was of its nature, assurance is opposed to doubt, as by faith he received it, he as a reasonable and understand-

Quia quantum
proceditur fi-
des nostra, quā-
tumque in hac
cognitione pro-
ficiuntur, simul au-
gescit in nobis
Dei iustitia, &
quodammodo
sanctificatur ejus
possessio.

Arg. 6. Sect. 23.

understanding agent did it, and knew the same, by faith he was persuaded and assured of the same, and so of God in Christ as revealed, of the promise in which God appeared to him Almighty, ingaging power for the same. This being added, let your argument and Mr. Walkers answer be turned loose together, and stand or fall.

For his ill-sounding phrase or two, at best, deserving rods, if not Scorpions: Let it be tried, the first is the repetition of the expreſſure censured in the former answer, to which all I will say is, let what is said by you and answered, be turned loose.

But he faith, the more Abraham rested on Gods power, the more justly did God count him a righteous man and impute Christs righteousness to him; which implies God doth with leſſe justice impute the righteousness of Christ to him then to a strong faith.

I answer, more justly may be considered in regard of ex-
pression or manifeſtation of it to us, for if it appeare justly to be done where the faith is weake, where it is strong the appearance is more cleare. Truly your advise is good, we cannot ſpeak too too conſiderately and aduifedly. I will ſay here, *Nemo sine crime vivit, & optimus ille qui minimis urgetur.* He is an happy man that offendeth not in what he blameth another. Woe be to your writing, this book, if Rods and Scorpions be made uſe of for every incoſiderate and unaduiled word or ſpeech.

Finally, that which is ſaid, that the object of Abrahams faith, was Gods power and ability, and your inference therefor not the righteousness of Christ, is in effect Bell. argument to exclude ſpeciall mercy,

Abraham did not believe ſins to be forgiven to him by ſpeciall mercy, but that he ſhould be the Father of many Nations, &c. That is he believed God who had promised to be omnipotens & moft faithfull, and thus ſaio was repented to him for righteouſneſſe.

Abraham non creditit ſibi per ſpeciallē misericordiam remiſſa fuſſe peccata; ſed ſe patrem futurum multarum gentiū, &c. Id eft, creditit Deum qui promicerat omnipotētē ac fidelissimum, atque hac fides ei reputata fuſſe in iuſtificatiōe: ergo.

Patrem anſwering, granteth that Abraham did believe

those things which his adversary saith, but that did not exclude his faith of speciall mercy in pardon by Christ, and then :

Creditit Abraham Deo non solum promis-
tentia filium ex Sara, sed etiam promissionem
benedictionem omnibus gentibus in semine
nascitur ex filio Sara : In semine tuo bene-
dicetur omnes Gentes. Hoc vero semen
Apostolus ad Galatas docet esse Christum, &
benedictionem interpretatur redemptionem
ab execratione, & justificationem per fidem
ad Rom. 4. 11. clarius dicit Abraham fuisse
Imputatam justitiam fidei, &c.

*Justification by faith, and Rom. 4. 11. be more clearly faith, than
unto Abraham was imputed righteousness by faith.*

We beleeveth in *Iesus Christ* for *pardon* in the *Creed*, and
God Almighty, so did God appeare to *Abraham*. Christ and
his righteousness are not opposed to Gods omnipotence,
they are subordinate : And now to the seventh Argu-
ment.

Arg. 7. Sect. 34.

*That faith that is imputed, is beleeving in him who raised
up Christ from the dead, vers. 24. Christ's righteousness is not
our believeth in him that raised up Christ from the dead : it
therefore is not imputed.*

I answer, your assumption and conclusion (which is a common fault) are laid downe only of the righteousness of Christ, not of faith, whereas, what you are to improve, is faith in a Relative sense, and taking in Christ and his righteousness, which had you done, the answer had beene easie. This faith taking in Christ and his righteousness is faith in *God which raised up the Lord Christ from the dead*, the same faith that believeth in Christ and his righteousness, believeth in *God that raised up Christ*, so is it laid downe, *1 Pet. 1. 21.* upon it our justification dependeth ; and if it were not, the Apostle saith our *faith is vain*, and we are yet in our *sins*. Christ's Resurrection supposeth him fully satisfying by obedience, even *unill death*, acquitted. In the *Creed* there is faith in *God Almighty*, and in *Iesus Christ, dead and risen*, &c. whence our remission of finnes

*Abraham beleeveth God not only
promising a sonne of Sarah, but also
promising blessednesse to all Nations in
his seed to be borne of the sonne of Sa-
rah; In thy seed shall all Nations be
blessed. The Apostle to the Galati-
ans, teacheth this seed truly to be
Christ, and interpreth the blessing
Redemption from the curse, and justifi-
cation by faith, and Rom. 4. 11. be more clearly faith, than
unto Abraham was imputed righteousness by faith.*

finnes and life everlasting. Who can lay anything to the charge of Gods chosen? Who can condemn? It is Christ that is dead, yea, rather than is risen, &c.

Here is sweet harmony, I will leave this also to any reasonable judgement.

The summe of it is thus much as laid downe by your selfe. *The point of imputation in justification being only handled in this Scripture, and no where else explained, it is no waies probable but that the Apostle shoulde speake somewhat distinckly and plainly of the nature of it, otherwise he might seeme rather to lay a stumbling blocke in the way, then to write any thing for the learning and comfort of Christians.*

VII. Arg. Sec. 2.

25.

To this I will first take the boldnesse to answer, and then consider of the matter as betweene you and Mr Walker.

1. I answer the point of Imputation is not onely handled in this Scripture, it is handled, Gen. 15. 6. and then Psal. 32. which are the foundations of what the Apostle here doth concerning the same, and after, Gal. 3. 6.

C. 7. St. 14.

2. It is elsewhere explained manifestly, Rom. 3. 24. Rom. 5. 17, 18, 19. Rom. 8. 4. & Rom. 10. 4. Tea, 1 Cor. 1. 30. 2 Cor. 5. ult. whereas Christ, and his righteousness, and obedience are laid downe that by which, so by imputation. *To be made just by the justice of another, is to be just by imputation, it being not possible for any man to be just by anothers justice, but by imputation, saith Mr. Bradshaw.* So is Adams finne ours, so is our finne Christs, so is Christs righteousness ours by imputation, as all our Divines.

Now by the foundation judge of your superstructives.

I adde, this speech is a distinct and plaine speech, which appeareth by the unanimous judgement of all reformed Writers (but you Mr. Wotton, Arminius, &c.) against the Papists, who stumble at Christs righteousness, and establish their owne.

As also by all places of Scripture wherein the effects given to faith that justifieth, are given to it in respect of its relation to Christ, as his proper effects to faith merely as an instrument causing union and fellowship with him by whom they are effected.

Your

Your interpretation is a mere stumbling blocke, and destroyer of comfort. This a principall foundation of comfort. The kernell of the Gospel and head of consolation, as Junius. Saint Paul judged it so when as he accounted all as dung, and would be found not having his owne righteousness, therefore not faith in a proper sense, his, and a kind of righteousness, but that which is by faith. I will finish this, making it my prayer, which Doctor Pridene did.

Faxit Deus optimus maximus ut nos omnia pro detrimentis habeamus, & competreremus in eo non habentes justitiam nostram, quia est ex operibus, sed cum que est ex hinc. The greatest and best God grant that we may account all for loss, and may be found in him not having our owne righteousness, which is of works. (I will add) faith in a proper sense

opposed in justification to the righteousness of Christ; but that which is by faith, which faith receiveth and appliceth, the righteousness of Christ Active and passive; those robes of righteousness and garments of salvation. In him to that end.

But it is meete you should be heard.

You say, to this Mr. Walker answereth now. Let the Reader see there, and in his last booke, and judge if his answer be now.

You goe on. Only he gravely instructeth us, that it is more comfortable to us for to rest on Christ's righteousness, &c. then to build on faith, which in the best is mingled and stained with many doubts often times.

Surely this is grave advise, though you jest, you may finde it one day as some Papists have dying, what ever you doe in dispute, when as your soule shall be ready to take its flight from your body, and that to appear before Gods tribunall. It will wish it may (and I pray it may,) appeare, nay, it must appeare in, clothed with this righteousness of Christ imputed by God, applied by faith, if then it hath comfort: in agone quanti Papists? Papists then esteeme of this.

You goe on relating what Mr. W. faith, viz. Therefore the Apostle doubtless intends Christ's righteousness, and so he doth express in plaine words (to another purpose) C. 5. i. 9. 8. 4. & I answer

I answer, those words to another purpose, are your own words, in good time it shall be tried.

These are more then *num*, and Mr. Walker saith the Apostle plainly expresteth that faith imputed, is called righteousness imputed by those texts, vers. 6, & 11. It had beene fairer for you to have answered *num*.

Against part of this (you say) Mr. Walker maketh an opposition betwene things of the most direct and essentiaall subordination that can be, and which doe inseparably involve one the other, resting on Christis righteousness, and building on faith.

1. I answer. If Mr Walker did doe so, he failed as you in all your arguments, or most of them. Your fault was to make opposition betwene those things which are subordinate, as before.

2. It is none of Mr. Walkers fault, he doth not make opposition betwene faith and Christis righteousness. It is your selfe in stating the question. You say, *faith in a proper sense is imputed, and not the righteousness of Christ*: as a worke in a proper sense, you oppose it, and it is indeed opposed to the righteousness of Christ, so there is no subordination. It is true of the figurative sense you dispute against, that faith involveth the righteousness of Christ in this place overthroweth your cause, you must be beholding for an interpretation here to your friends the Papists, or you are gone.

You say *it is impossible that a man should not build on faith, that doth not rest on Christis righteousness, that is, the satisfaction which he hath made*, because *faith is a resting on this satisfaction, and so a resting on Christis righteousness, includeth a building on faith*; for who can rest on this righteousness, except he believes that such a resting on this will stand him instead?

1. Here you grant faith a resting on Christis righteousness. It is true, the faith that receiveth and applieth the same, cleaveth and adhereth to it and resteth on it, then let not an instant alone, nor worke of the understanding: this establisheth our Relative sense.

*To that other, building up faith, and that by an other be-
S leving*

leeveng, it is but a Castle in the aire ; at best it is but an assent or beliefe which the Devill hath, wha beleeveth, *that he that beleeveth in Christ shall be saved.* It is a beleeving in a beleeving, which in your sense is a worke, which is opposed to *Christ's* righteousnesse in justification by your doctrine. For the establishing the one, you deny the other, and so destroy subordination. It is safest to rest only on that Rocke *Christ*, there is no other foundation; S. Paul did so, when as he would be found not having his owne righteousness, as faith in a proper sense, such as it is.

But you say. Sure I am that Paul built upon *faith* for justification as well as on the righteousness of *Christ* (as Master Walkers beloved phrase is) though in a different manner (which hath beeene formerly explained, when he said we know that a man is not justified by the workes of the Law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, and as Christ speaketh concerning himself, John 12. 44. *He that beleeveth in me, beleeveth not in me, but in him that sent me, that is, not so much in me, as in him that sent me.* So may it be said, he that buildeth on *faith*, buildeth not on *faith*, but on the truth and faithfulnes of him who hath promised *forgivenes of sinnes and salvation* to him that beleeveth.)

1. Let the Reader note, how you speaking of building (for justification on *faith* and on the righteousness of *Christ*) the former is currant, the other Mr. Walkers beloved phrase, building on the righteousness is Mr. Walkers phrase; would a man thinke this man a Christian that readeth this so jeeringly proposed, or that there were such a direct and essential subordination as was asserted but now, and such an inseparable involution? surely it would raise much doubt. It is very offensive to me, and I conceive it much more to God and *Christ*, no marvell that establishing *faith* in a proper sense you say and not the righteousness of *Christ*.

2. Doe you not bring in *Paul* building on two opposite foundations according to your doctrine? a work and *Christ*? the error he refuteth to the *Rom.* and *Galatians*?

And whether he be not brought in equally building on *faith*.

faith and Christ? your phrase is *as well*, whether it agreeth with Saint Paul's spirit, who would be found in him, not having his own righteousness? which faith is in your sense, *but that which is by faith* which it receiveth. Saint Paul's words that he believed in Christ, *that he might be justified by* faith of Christ, are no more then this, that he believed in Christ, *that so by that faith in Christ he might be justified;* knowing that (not works) the onely way, here is no believing by believing on believing, his building by believing is in Jesus Christ, which is no other then believing in him for justification. By that very place faith as a worke is excluded by Saint Paul.

If all workes together justifie not,
how should that worke of faith ju-
stifie, that is, make just before God?

Note it then.

The true sense is, which the Apostle in the 3. c. will explaine, that we receive the blessing of Abraham by faith. Now the blessing of Abraham is remission of sinnes, and imputation of righteousness received by faith, because of Christ's merit. This Rom. 4. 6. be said to be imputed to us for righteousness: which phrase is comparatively to be understood, for that, the obedience of Christ applied by faith

to be imputed to us for righteousness, or righteousness to be imputed for the obedience of Christ applied by faith, as is largely demonstrated in my Commentary on the Romans.

And for the other place where you say, *It may be said* be that buildeth on faith, buildeth not on faith, but on the faithfulness of God, promising forgivenesse to a believer. Though it be true of Christ, that he that by faith believeth on him, buildeth on Gods faithfulness, or as otherwise revealed, and of faith in a Relative sense. As it is considered with his object, *as when the Church is said to be founded upon the faith of Peter, by the Anteius, and we have shewed,*

Si enim omnia opera simul non justificant
(as Parens) quomodo opus fidei justificaret,
hoc est justos sacerter coram Deo? In locum.

Sensus verus est quem Apostolus c. 3. explicabit, nos fide benedictionem Abraham suscipere; benedictio autem Abraham est remissio peccatorum & justitiae imputatio propter Christi meritum fide accepta, hoc ad Rom. 4. 6. dixit, fidem nobis imputari ad justitiam: quæ phrasis correlative intelligenda est, pro obedientiam Christi fide applicatam nobis imputari ad justitiam, seu justitiam imputari propter obedientiam Christi fide applicatam, ut in Comment. ad Rom. prolixæ est demonstrarum, Id. ib.

Ut consideramus
cum objecto
suo, ut cum di-
citur Ecclesia
super fide Petri
fundata apud
veteres, & nos
&c. ac Chm.

It is not so of faith in a proper sense, your faith.

There is somewhat considerable yet, and that is the subordination here spoken of, especially as in the cited text, *John 12. 44.* he that believeth in me, believeth not in me, *but* in him that sent me. And I intreat you to ponder.

1. Whether faith in Christ the Mediatour and God be not the same, and in the morall Law as faith in God, surely either both or neither are by this text, that sticketh you see in my stomach.

2. That it is not incongruous that the same faith which laieth hold on Christ and his righteousness, should lay hold on God also, it is *in him, and him that sent him;* him as revealed, God, as *Rom. 4. a quickner of the dead, able, raising up Christ.* What then becommeth of those arguments you make to exclude Christ and his righteousness from faith imputed to *Abraham?* It seemeth these may consist, there is a subordination and involution of God as in Christ, in faith in *Christ.*

It may occasion other thoughts to put the Crowne on Christs head, to deny it to faith in a proper sense as opposed to the righteousness of Christ, in the point of Justification.

You say, *for the mixture or staining of faith with many doubtings, this is no consideration at all, to detain or keepe a man from building upon it, if it be faith unfeigned and true, because there is the same justification and salvation promised to the weakest faith and to the strongest.*

If faith were taken in a Relative sense, it might be granted, because of the object, the righteousness of Christ, here is perfect righteousness, all the Law requireth, *be being the end of the Law for righteousness to a believer; take both, you have the condition of the Gospel:* no matter for strength or weaknesse of faith in the point of Justification.

It is not so for faith in a proper sense, not involving but excluding the righteousness of Christ.

You have nothing to object to Gods just judgement, gracie acceptation of faith, for the perfect obedience of

of the Law, in a proper sense, that Arminian brat destroyeth Gods justice: and that faith can no more be accepted then any grace else, it is worse, then to put all graces as the Papists doe, as our owne teach you, you shall never prove it the condition of the Gospel.

Why may I not say the same of Repentance in generall, of love, or the feare of God? these as imperfect as they are, justifie as well as faith (in your sense) if that be a sufficient reason alone, it is what hath the promise, see 1 *Jes.* 16. 17, 18. faith so taken is not the onely condition or quality; all graces, I, workes else have their place. It is not faith alone that justifieth: and how can any of these be instead of personall righteousness, perfect obedience due to the Law, which is your tenet of this faith. It is necessary to take in Christ and the righteousness of Christ, for which faith hath a peculiar working; it is the consent of the soule, whence marriage indeed, union, communion with Christ his righteousness, and all his benefits.

In the next place answers are given to those places where P. 88.
faith and hope are used to signifie their object.

1. To which Mr. W. faith, First, you grant the Apostles used such tropes.

2. When as you say the habit of faith may be used to signifie the object, but not the act, be answereib, Gal. 1. 22. & 3. 23. & Col. 1. 5. the habit and act both, yea the act is principally meant.

3. And thirdly, that you grant the act so used, but shife it by denying Christs righteousness the object of believing, which be hath proved.

4. And lastly, that you deny Christs righteousness the object of faith as it justifieth, whereas it is the proper object.

To these you say, That you will not be troublesome to the Reader here to relate the passage he striketh at, and tell us of copies in some mens bands.

These I must passe, necessarily keeping counsell, and take for granted what is not accepted against it.

The substance of the answer consists you say in three untruths.

1. When he saith the act of faith is to be understood, Gal. 1. 22. & 3. 23. & Col. 1. 5. its contrary is true.

To which all I will say is this, that I know not how to define faith or hope without the mention of the object therein, and that to the being of faith and hope there is necessarily union with, or acting on the object; there is no faith, nor hope in God, but it butteth on him.

2. Whereas Mr. Walker saith he hath proved the righteousness or active obedience of Christ to be the object of faith as justifying. You say he bath not in all his discourse made the least haire of that head blacke or white.

1. I answer, first, those words or active obedience of Christ are your words, not Mr. Walker's, his words are Christ's righteousness, which though Mr. Walker excludeth not, yet with him that is not all, he meaneth active and passive righteousness.

Rom. 3. 25.

For the Passive obedience, I hope that shall be acknowledged the object of faith as it justifieth. Christ dead is the object of faith in the Creed for remission of sinnes; and the Apostle faith, as that we are justified freely by grace through, &c. So whom God hath set forth a propitiation through faith in his blood.

And I demand whether faith that justifieth be not confessed by you faith in Christ, and that it is an instrument causing union, bringing us to participation of him and his benefits; Christ and his righteousness are the object of faith, which you granted to be an instrument.

I demand what that righteousness of God, Rom. 3. 22. which is by faith of Jesus Christ to all that believe? whether it be not Christ's? whether it be so called, Because God of his bounty bestoweth it on us, or therefore because it alone holdeth master before the Lord? as Calvin on the place. Once he resolved it, quam per fidem obtinemus, which by faith we obtaine; and that which must be justice at Gods tribunall, as Calvin. Where none is accounted righteousness unless perfect and absolute obedience to the Law, as the same Author, where I teade farther.

If so be that no man be found that hath attained such ex-
cellency.

John 3. 18.

*Ubi nulla justificarietur nisi perfecta abso-
luta Legis obediencia.*

all holiness, is followeth that all are without righteousness in themselves. Then Christ must help, who as he is alone just, so by transferring his righteousness on us, maketh us just. Now thou seest how the righteousness of faith is the righteousness of Christ; that therefore we may be justified— Christ is the matter, the word with faith the instrument. Therefore faith is said to justify, because it is the instrument of receiving Christ, in whom righteousness is communicated to us.

After that we are partakers of Christ, not only our selves are just, but our works are reputed just before the Lord. So Calvin.

What righteousness is that, Rom. 4. 6. and that righteousness of faith, vers. 11. What that the Gentiles attained, and the Jews submitted not to, but stumbled at? Rom. 9. Saith Calvin, they did stumble at Christ, by whom alone the way to obtain righteousness is open.

Christ is given to us for righteousness.

Christ's honour is placed in this, that he be light, salvation, life, resurrection, righteousness, bealing to us all; where also we may see of whose and what righteousness he speaketh.

We have elsewhere said, how men put on righteousness by faith, because forsooth Christ's righteousness is imputed to them.

And then he sheweth the righteousness of faith to be established out of the very doctrine of the Law.

Let us remember therefore, that those that are righteous by faith, are just out of themselves, forsooth in Christ.

Who saith elsewhere, we are accounted just before God, for as much as we bring the perfect obedience of the Law, for righteousness as opposed to the transgression of the Law, even in the least point; because we have not that in our selves, God doth freely give it us.

What is that Phil. 3. where Saint Paul will be found in *tempore in Christo*. Justicoram Deo censemur, quia afferimus perfectam Legis obedienciam, nam justitia transgressioni Legis etiam in minimo apice opponitur; quia cum non habemus in nobis, Deus nobis gratuio donat, id, ad Gal. 3. 6.

Quod si nemo hominum reperitur qui ad tam exactam sanctitatem concenderet, sequitur omnes justitia in se ipsis destituti. Tum occurrit Christus oportet, qui ut solus justus est, ita suam justitiam in nos transferendo justos nos reddit. Nunc vides ut justitia fidei, justitia Christi sit; ut ergo justificemur— Christus materia, verbum cum fide instrumentum; quare fides justificare dicitur, quia instrumentum est recipiendi Christi, in quo nobis communicatur justitia. Postquam Christi sumus participes non ipsis solum justi sumus, sed opera nostra justa reputantur coram Deo.

In Christum impingebant, per quem unum ad justitiam adipiscendum patet aditus, ad vers. 30.

Datus nobis in justitiam Christus est. v. 32.

Christi dignitas in hoc sita est, ut sit humen, salus, vita, resurrexio, justitia, medicina nobis omnibus. ib.

Diximus autem alibi quomodo justitiam. fide induant homines, quia sc. imputatur illis Christi justitia. ib.

C. 10 3. & v. 5. Mcminimus ergo qui fide justi sunt extra se justos esse, klm.

Fides offertnam
dom hominem
Deo, ut Christi
justitia induatur.

Deus nos justifi-
ficer, sua boni-
tate, vel quod
justitiam ab ip-
so donata fide
recipiamus.

Justitiam Dei
accipio, quia a-
pud Dei tribu-
nal approbatur
In ipso fidei
Aetate, sc. Chri-
sto Domino
meo qui est ju-
stitia — fidei
autem est quia
per fidem illam
apprehendi-
mus cum sicim-

putata & Christi merito nobis applicetur. *Ad Phil. 3. 9.* Inveniri in Christo tacitam ha-
ber relationem ad Dei iudicium, is enim in amando contemplatur unum summum Christum in
quo acquiscat, itaque quos comperit in Christo esse (id est Christo per fidem infertos) in
iis nullam invenit condemnationem, quia justitia qualiter ille requirit a nobis, id est, perfecta,
accumulata, exornatost eos invenit, nimirum Christi justitia per fidem nobis imputata. *Ber.*
in locum.

Dr. Whitaker
against Camp.
See Dr. English.
p. 233.
ib.

bim having that righteousness which is by the faith of Christ, the
righteousness which is of God by faith, on which place Calvin.
Faith offereth man naked to God, that he may be clothed with
Christ's righteousness.

Where also he saith, righteousness of faith to be of God —
but because God justifieth us by his goodness, or because we may
receive by faith righteousness given from him.

I take that to be the righteousness of God which is approved at
Gods tribunal.

In him, forsorib, Christ my Lord, who is righteousness — But it
is said to be of faith, because by faith we apprehend it, seeing it
is imputed and is applied to us by Christ's merit.

To be found in Christ bath a secret relation to Gods judg-
ment, for he in loving doth behold his one Christ in whom he is
well pleased; therefore those whom he doth finde to be in Christ,
that is, infest to him by faith, in whose he findeth no condemnation,
because he findeth them adorned with righteousness such as he re-
quiert of us, that is, perfekt and beaped up, forsorib, Christ's
righteousness imputed to us by faith.

Ad Phil. 3. 9. Inveniri in Christo tacitam ha-
ber relationem ad Dei iudicium, is enim in amando contemplatur unum summum Christum in
quo acquiscat, itaque quos comperit in Christo esse (id est Christo per fidem infertos) in
iis nullam invenit condemnationem, quia justitia qualiter ille requirit a nobis, id est, perfecta,
accumulata, exornatost eos invenit, nimirum Christi justitia per fidem nobis imputata. *Ber.*
in locum.

Christ himself must be put upon us that we may be found
in him, Rom. 13. 14. Phil. 3. 9. 2 Cor. 5. &c. with his clo-
thing our selves must be clothed, that they may be beautified and
gloriously adorned, Phil. 3. 9. when he excludes all kinds of
works, he must needs understand the righteousness of Christ.

This also is the constant doctrine of all reformed
Churches, some few Divines excepted, and those noted
too.

And lastly say you where be affirmes this righteousness of
Christ to be the only object of faith, as justifying, whereas it
hath beene evidently demonstrated, that is neither the proper nor
desire proper object thereof at such, and that the Scriptures no
where speakes so of it.

1. To which I answer, by righteousness Mr. Walker
meaneth

meaneth not a part, but the whole.

3. Here may men take notice of your sincerity, calling Christ and his righteousness the object of faith, and faith an instrument in justification, when as yet you deny Christ's righteousness to be the proper or improper object of faith as it justifieth.

What followeth is but evill language.

I will passe that.

We come now to the fifth and last all of our Tragedy, as Sc. 3. ult.
you speake.

And pitch on that. *He blameth me farther for not being ashamed or blushing to affirme that from the times of Luther and Calvine, the fairest streams of Interpreters rame to water and refresh mine interpretation.* P. 92

To this you answere, No, and you know no reason you have of being ashamed or blushing for standing up for the truth. And thus if you shoule doe otherwise, concerning the judgement of the best Interpreters, since Luther and Calvines time touching the Scripture in question, then I doe, then I shoule be like unto you and speake what is contrary to the truth.

1. To all which, all that I will now say, is that I cannot but so much the more wonder at you.

2. For *Arminius* his interpretations being quite another way then yours.

And his being of the twaine nearer Mr. *Walker*, then Mr. *Goodwine*, we have scene already; let the Reader judge.

You say you have named Orthodox Authors for faith in a proper sense, and are ready to examine and scan their testimonies with any sober and dispassionate man whatsoever. Were I worthy to be accounted such a man, I would be for you.

Concerning *Abailard*, their dealing with him for incontinency. You say it is well for Mr. *Walker* that there is not a Law of like penalty amongst us for incontinency of tongue, and feare Mr. *Walkers* manhood would be one of the first that should suffer.

But *quis nesciret*, &c, all I will say is; It is well for you, you would scarcely scape scotfree, were this book of yours in

G.

—

Answ.

in that respect before equall Judges. You would lose your manhood. For that man I have read that story, and elsewhere finde Mr. Walker was not the first that charged this errore on him. It is observed by that Lord.

Hanc item contra Bernardum exicit A. *This controverie a certaine man
Bailardus quidam, multis post seculis; qui called Abailardus stirred up against
him in postremis, non ulla tamen hic post-* Bernard many ages after, Who thought
Morney du pless. de missa, p 13. 27. *be were of the last, yet here was not be-*

Obedientia
Christi utique
non minus no-
stra, quam pec-
catum Ada.

*binds any. Where he sheweth out of Bernard; The obedience
of Christ is no less ours, than the sinne of Adam. He is wort-
thy reading. For your testimonies, Mr. Walkers answere and
they must be also turned loose together, as you Print them
and himselfe since, to which this containeth no answere
but vaine words, p. 94.*

Only you say, except much learning or somerwhat else had
set him and his wits at odds, he could never have affirmed that
no one Orthodox Divine either ancient or later ever understood
by faith imputed for righteousness, faith in a proper sense, but
the satisfaction of Christ himself, and that himselfe hath done
it often in this discours.

1. For him you have not shewed it.
2. For others it had beene easie to give an instance.
3. Sibrandus was of the same opinion, who therefore
challengeth Bertius twice, to shew, but one, one, I say one
place, which teacheth this in plaine words. I am so yet, I
have not met with one but Mr. Watson &c.

For his Testimonies, you promise brevity, and why? Be-
cause, say you, I verily believe the Author himselfe would have
spared it, had he but rightly bare understood the opinion a-
gainst which he hath armed himselfe with so much fury, and
what is meant by satisfaction proper sense.

Confidens animi, &c. I wish the knowledge had beene
still kepte with you.

For Testimonijs you say, because they prove that which
no man questions, viz. Justification by the righteousness and
satisfaction of Jesus Christ in a meritorious way, and do not so
much as touch on cause, were the point in controverie, except it
be in way of contradiction to himselfe that produceth them, I
take

take my leave of them at once, and with them rest and peace.

Sir, I commend your wisdom, this is a short cut, if you can so get off. But you must not thus escape, nor your meritorious way. It is as a City of refuge when you are closely followed. You thinke your selfe safe when as you get it once over your head. It is (as you say of Metaleptick oyle) your suret pinhorse; in this it differeth, that is shewed the answer of learned *Protestants*; this is a borrowed shift of *Papists*, who use it as you against the imputation of Christ's righteousness. I meete with it often confuted by the Worthies of our side. It may be they may satisfie you, I promised it before, now I will labour to be as good as my word.

I therefore assert that it is not enough, and so neither the scope of the holy Ghost, nor writers Protestant, that Christ's righteousness be a meritorious cause of justification, but there must be also an application thereof to this effect, which is done by Gods imputation and our application of the same by faith; by which imputed by God and applied by us, it is effectuall to our justification, that whereby we are just before God.

For Christ should be in vaine given for righteousness, unless there shall be an enjoyment by faith.

But when we came first to Christ, first there is found in him exact righteousness of the Law, which by imputation is made ours.

For truly, howsoeuer we be redeemed by Christ, yet until by the calling of the Father we are inset into his communion, we are both darkness and beires of death, and the aduersaries of God.

The merit of Christ is the matter, out of us subjectively, imputatively truly ours.

Doctor Dixmant to that part of Bell. where he laying downe the state of the question, saith.

Imo vero utcunque a Christo redempti sumus, donec ratiōnē vocatiōne patris incertum in illius communione hem & leathers, & mortis heredes & Dei aduersari sumus. *Cah. Instit. L. 3. n. 14. Sif. 6.* Nescio Christi materia extra nos subjective, imputative vere nostra, sicut Doctor Dixmant. *De Jusit. p. 196.*

Quæstio est de causa formalis, at vocula proper non formalis sed meritioriam defiguntur.

Sit itaque, saith the Doctor, Christi obedientia causa meritioria justificationis nostræ propter quam Deus nos justificat.

Arque revera in justificatione talis causa formalis ponenda est quia simul & meritioria esse possit, nisi enim continetur illam dignitatem in se, propter quam homo rite justificatus reputetur, nunquam erit causa formalis per quam justificatus existat in conspectu Dei. *De just.,* bab. c. 32. p. 312.

a man shall be justified in the sight of God.

Eadem igitur & unica justitia Christi, in se & suo valore considerata, est meritioria causa humanæ justificationis; considerata autem quarecumque imputatur, donatur, applicatur tantum suæ singulis credentibus, & in Christum infitus, subit vicem causæ formalis— Deus ergo qui non justificat nisi respectu ad absolutionem justificationis, Christi justificationem quæ sola talis est, intuetur, atque cum Christi membris imputare dignatur, quo facto agit cum illis & statuit de illis ac si esset illorum, atque hoc est facere Christi justificationem causam formalis justificationis nostræ. *Ag. 10. c. 28.*
p. 373.

pute the same to Christ's members; which being done, be dealib with them, and determineth of them, as if it were their owne, and this it is to make Christ's righteousness the formal cause of our justification. Where also take notice of his stating the question betweene us and Romanists.

Christi mediatoris in nobis inhabitantis arque per spirum sanctum sese nobis uniti per perfellissimam obedientiam est formalis causa justificationis nostræ, utpote quæ ex donatione Dei & applicatione fidei sit nostra. *Id. p. 313.*

The question is of the formal cause, but that word *for,* doth not denote the formal but meritorious cause.

Let therefore Christ's obedience be the meritorious cause of our justification, for which God doth justify us. What followeth now?

And truly in justification such a formal cause is to be put which also together may be meritorious; for unless it containe in it selfe that worth for which a man is rightly reputed justified, it will never be a formal cause by which

Therefore one and the same righteousness of Christ, considered in its selfe and its worth, is the meritorious cause of mans justification. But considered as it is imputed, given, applied or their owne to all believers, and infest into Christ, is in instead of a formal cause— God therefore who justifieth not but with respect to absolute righteousness, heboldeth Christ's righteousness, which is only such, and is pleased to im-

pute the same to Christ's members; which being done, be dealib with them, and determineth of them, as if it were their owne, and this it is to make Christ's righteousness the formal cause of our justification, as that which by the gift of God and application of faith be made ours.

There is Protestant Doctrine flourishing in Cambridge in my time, the Antithesis of the Papist followeth.

The obedience or righteousness of the Mediator, is not given or applied to believers in the place or by way of a formal cause, by whose virtue they stand justified or accepted of God to eternall life.

I need not to make uses of these passages, they are cleare, as for other, so the present purpose.

I will take one place out of that Orthodox Doctor *Tossanus.*

The matter truly is the obedience of Christ, or his merit—the forme is the imputation thereof, and remission of sinnes; which is done by and for the bloud of Christ, which being imputed causeth that the righteousness of Christ which was anothers is made ours, truly and really no lesse by imputation

then it is Christis by action, because we are inset to him, and it is truly given to us, and indeed accepted of God. So the Palatinate.

Come we now to that great Doctor of France, *Chamier*, he speaking of Papists, saith :

Therefore they beleive not Christis righteousness to be an inward cause, that is the matter as we speake of justification, but outward onely, or the merit. He goeth on.

Andradius (a great stickler in the Councell of Trent taught,

That our justification in Christ, or Christ to be our righteousness, to signifie no other thing, then Christ to have merited true and expresse righteousness for us. Thus he laieth downe their tenet. Now for the Protestants, thus :

But Protestants conclude—But justification by which we be just with God to be imputation of righteousness inhering in Christ, which shall not be

Mediatoris obedientia sive iustitia non donatur sive applicatur credentibus, vice aut per medium causa formalis, cuius virtute sicut iustificari ait Deo in eternam vitam acceptari. Id. id.

Materia quidem est obedientia Christi sive meritum ipsius— forma est illius imputatio, & remissio peccatorum, que sit per & properter sanguinem Christi, que imputata facit ut iustitia Christi que erat aliena nostra sit, vere & realiter, non minus per imputacionem quam est Christi per actionem, quia ei iniusti sumus & nobis vere donatur, & vere a Deo acceptatur. Thes. 11. p. 62. ad Rom.

Itaque iustitiam Christi non credant esse intrinsecam causam, hoc est materiam, ut nos loquimur, justificationis, sed extrinsecam duntaxat, sive meritum. L. 3. c. 1. Sess. 2.

Andradius in Christo nos iustificari, sive Christum esse iustitiam nostram nihil significare aliud, quam Christum veram expressumque iustitiam nobis promeruisse.

Catholici vero statunt— sed iustificationem per quam apud Deum iusti sumus, est imputationem iustitiae Christi inherenter, quae non potuerit alio modo nobis merita vim tam nisi sic imputaretur.

ab'e any other way to merit life unto us unless it be so imputed.

I will transcribe another passage, and so doe two things at once, that is, speake to this and the point of being sinners by Adam. For in both these you agree with Papists, the matter will be manifest by bare laying downe.

Concedimus sane per inobedientiam Adami constitui omnes vere & re ipsa inherente in iustitia iustos: sed alterum patrem non Adami iustitia imputata, hoc dicimus esse falsum. Imo contra negamus posse nos fieri iustos iustitia inherente per unum hominem, nisi unus unus hominis iustitia nobis imputetur— quare falsum est non imputari posteris iustitiam Adami. C. 2. Sess. 9.

must be imputed unto us— therefore it is false that the disobedience of Adam is not imputed to his posterity. He goeth on,

Nec mover me Peterius commentans in hec ipsa Pauli verba— non dixit Paulus (inquit, quasi aliquid magnum, neque aliis observatum in theologia inveniret) inobedientia Adami coiputata esse peccatores ne quis putaret per inobedientiam imputatam: sed dixit per inobedientiam, videlicet per peccatum intrinsecum manent in ipsis ab Adami inobedientia profectam. Similiter ergo non quod Christi obedientia confituant iustos quasi sunt homines non per iustitiam inherentem sed per imputatam: sed per obedientiam constituti iustos, quia haec causa fuit meritoria. Enim vero cui se speravit persuasorum priorem illam Phrasin, iustitia iustos, iustitia iustos heri non nisi formaliter (ut illi loqui aintur) alteram vero pte jutitiam, per obedientiam non nisi merito significare?— quare nihil obstat phrasis quidem quo minus illud per iustitiam, unless multa confundantur iustificare intelligamus dictum, ut iustitia illa sit non tantum meritoria causativa Papistis volunt, sed etiam formaliter, per quam nos nunc sumus apud Deum iusti. C. 2. Sess. 12.

formally (as they love to speake) but the other, by righteousness and

Truly we grant by the disobedience of Adam all to be constituted truly unjust and with injustice indeed inheriting. But the other part, that we are not unjust by the injustice of Adam imputed, we say this is false. Tea on the contrary we deny that we can be made unjust, by injustice inherenter, by one man, unless the injustice of this one

Ne iver dare Peterius (the Jesuite) move me commenting on these very words of Paul.— Paul said not (saith he as if he brings into Divinity some great thing, and not observed by others) us to be constituted sinners by the disobedience of Adam, lest one should think it by imputed disobedience, but he said by disobedience, that is, by sinne remaining within them, conuincing from Adams disobedience. After the same manner therefore, not that Christ's righteousness shoulde constitute just, or if men were made just, not by inherenter righteousness, but by imputed; but to be made just by obedience, because this was the meritoria our cause. But whom did he hope to perswade, that first phrase to be made just by righteousness, unjust by non-righteousness, in otherwise than formallie (as they love to speake) but the other, by righteousness and

and obedience, not so significative otherwise then by way of merit? — Therefore that phrase truly nothing bindeth, but that, by the righteousness of one man, shall be constituted righteousness, we may so understand and to be spoken, that that righteousness may be not only the meritorious cause of the Papists world, but also the formal by which we are now just with God. And againe.

The first place out of Rom. 5. Bellarmine and Becanus (both Jesuites) doe so expound, that they deny the obedience of Christ to be called the formal cause of our justification, but the efficient; they provest the obedience of Christ is opposed to the disobedience of Adam, and as we may be said by this to be constituted unjust, by that just. But by the disobedience of Adam we are constituted just not formally, but efficiently and meritoriously. But to this sophisme we have already disputed in the second chapter.

Here therefore againe I grant, both the disobedience of Adam and the obedience of Christ, to constitute us both efficiently and meritoriously just or unjust, far of that none beare us denying; and of the other we have expressly disputed in the ninth booke of this Tome; but we constantly deny that both are not imputed unto us. Yes, we deny they can meritoriously make us either unjust or just, unlesse they be first imputed, for they are no wayes made ours unlesse they be imputed. For they are singular and individuall acts, and therefore proper to them from whom they are, and singular personall. But for proper and personall acts to be common it is absurd
and

Primum locum, ex Rom. 5. Bellarmine & Becanus ita explicant ut negent obedientiam Christi dici formalem nostrae justificationis nostrae causam sed efficientem: probant quia opponatur justitia Christi inobedientie Adami, & sicut per hanc iniusti iam per illam justificamus constituti: atque per inobedientiam Adami non formaliter, sed efficienter & meritorie constitutus iniusti ergo similiter per obedientiam Christi non formaliter sed efficienter & meritorie constitutus justi. Sed ad hoc sophisma jam disputatione est, c. 2.

Hic ergo item concedo & inobedientiam Adami, & obedientiam Christi constitutere nos & efficienter & meritorie iniustos justosve, nam & de illa nemo nos audire negantes, & de illa capite disputavimus ipsi tomis hujus, l. 9. Sed non imputari nobis utramque constanter negamus. Illa negamus posse nos meritorie effici huc iniustos five justos, nisi prius imputaverit: nam si non imputentur nullo modo nostrae sunt, sunt enim actus singulare & individui, itaque proprii eorum a quibus sunt, & propriae personales, atque autem proprios & personales esse communes absurdum est & contradictionem. Itaque oportet imputari, nam haec communicatio non opponitur proprietati quia ratio longe est alia; Itaque ipsum Adam peccatum, ipsam illam inquam inobedientiam necesse fuit imputari postea se premito etiam Christi obedientiam. Illam quidem quia Adams est fuit in quo esse sentebant universum genus humana per naturam. Ille vero quia in Christo est universa multitudo fidelium, per gratiam inde latentes, ut non tantum per Adaman peccatores sed fint omnes, sed in ipso peccato dicantur, quod longe aliud est.

est. Dico igitur certum esse, & ab Adam realiter in iustus omnes esse consit uos, & à Christo omnes fideles, realiter iustos, sed nego id ab Apostolo considerari, qui causa porius inquirat prima, tum illius condamnationis, tum iustificationis. Nam & x³ rema considerat jam tum in Adams, non tam in Adams peculiare, sed pertinens ad omne genus humanum. Ut sensus sit, jam tum cum Adams damnatum fuisse universum genus humankinde sic factum reum inobedientie in Deum, unde etiam apud Augustinum peccatum dicitur originis pena primi peccati; quomodo autem pena esset nisi illud ipsum primum peccatum imputaretur?

Similiter in Christo ipso universa fidelium multitudo dicitur facta five justificata, siue quod idem est ipse Christus factus omnibus iustitia, five omnes in Christo facti iustitia. — Sed quia illa ipsa Christi iustitia sit nobis communicata per gratiam, tam certo, ut certo sit nostra, nec minus certo quam si ipsi prestatissimus, qui non potuimus. Brevisiter utrumque verum est, iustitiam Christi esse causam efficientem five meritoram nostrae iustitiae. — Et rursus, five formaliter ut Bellarmine, five materialiter ut nos maluimus, causam nostra iustificationis. Cham. de justif. c. 17. Sess. 10. 11, 12, 13. Ex. p. 902.

to judgement, be considereth in Adam then, yet not peculiar to Adam, but appertaining to whole mankind that the sense may be, even then when Adam sinned, whole mankind to be damned or made guilty of disobedience against God, whence also in Augustine, originall sinne is called the punishment of the first sin. But how should it be the punishment unless that same first sinne should be imputed?

In like manner in Christ the whole multitude of faithfull, is said to be made or justified, or which is the same, Christ himself made to all righteousness. — But because that same righteousness of Christ, so communicated to us by grace, so surely, that it may be surely ours, nor lesse surely than our selves had performed it, which we could not doe.

Briefly,

and contradictory. Therefore they must be imputed, for this communion is not opposed to propriety, because there is a far other reason of them, therefore it was necessary that the very sinne of Adam, I say that very same disobedience should be imputed to his posterity, and therefore also Christ's obedience. That truly because Adam was be, in whom humane nature in generall was judged to be by nature, but the other because there is the universall multitude of beleevers in Christ by grace; whence it commeth to passe that not only all are made sinners by Adam, but are said to have sinned, which is farre another thing.

I say therefore it is certaine that all are from Adam constituted really unrighteous, and all the faithfull from Christ really righteous. But I deny that to be considered of the Apostle, who rather inquireth into the first causes as of that condemnation, so of this justification, for both according

Briefly, both are true, that Christ's righteousness is the efficient or meritorious cause of our righteousness. — And also either the formal cause, as Bellarmine, or the materiall, as we would rather, of our justification. See him againe.

For both causes, both because Christ is the efficient cause of righteousness inhering in us, and because his satisfaction or merit is imputed unto us; we therefore thus determine Christ to be called our righteousness, and so as it followeth.

You see here your distinction and answer Popish, and refuted by our learned.

Know you not (saith Doctor Whitaker to Campion the Jesuite) that our sinnes were imputed to Christ, and why may not Christ's righteousness be imputed to us in like manner, &c. seeing you are compelled on the one side against your will, to confess an imputation, why doe yee not also grant it in the other? especially seeing the Apostle himselfe propoundeth to us this Antithesis, 2 Cor. 5. 21. Therefore we are so made righteous in Christ as he was made sinne for us, which must necessarily be understood of imputation, the payment is ours, no otherwise then by imputation. Consider on what side you are, and come about.

It is no marvel Arm. went before you & M.W in the same Arminius wrote Christ's obedienc to be the meritorious cause, p 84., &c. not the object of imputation. Let us heare himselfe.

I say faith is imputed unto us for Christ's sake and his righteousness; in which proposition, faith is the object of imputation, but Christ and his obedience the obtaining Cause or meritorious of justification, which Christ with his obedience is the object of our faith, and not the object of justification or divine imputation, as if God did impute unto us Christ and his righteousness, which cannot be. Let your admirers behold this, and your selfe denying your opinion to be Arminian, and they will say your opinion is as like as if it came out of Arminius his mouth.

Sect 22. & 23.

27.
Nos ergo sic
statuimus Christi-
anum dici justi-
tiam nostram.Against Camp.
Englisht.P.224.
Armin. scriptit
causam meri-
toriam Christi
obedientiam,
&c. non objec-
tum imputati-
onis, fest. Hom.

Dico fidem nobis imputari proper Christum & justitiam ejus, in qua ennuntiatione fides est objectum imputationis: Christus vero et obedientia ejus, est causa justificacionis imperatoria, sive meritoria, quia Christus cum obedientia sua objectum est nostre fidei, & non objectum justificacionis seu imputationis Divinæ, quali Deus nobis Christum eisque justitiam impiet ad justitiam, quod fieri nequit. Armin. Epist. ad Hypol.

It is the same in this busynesse.

You go on and say.

Only I cannot but take notice of a very strange pece of Divinity whereforever he had it—— Concerning Calvyn, here he teacheth that sinnes of commission are taken away by that part of Christ's satisfaction imputed, which is called his Passive obedience or voluntary suffering the penalty of the Law: and sinnes of commission by his Active obedience in fulfilling the righteousnesse which the Law requires, which is the other part of Christ's imputed satisfaction. This you call a Lernean Lake, of hidious and portentous Divinity, things you shoulde have censured Mr. Walker would not have received, though an Angel from Heaven shoulde have brought them to him.

But —*sua narret Ulysses.*

The summe is, there are sinnes of commission and of omission, such are all defects of what was to be in man, perfect righteousnesse. Though the guilt and punishment of all be taken away by the blood of Christ a Lambe, the defect must also be made up by the perfect obedience of Christ our Surety, he must and did doe this that we may live.

But say you, he affirmes the taking away of sinnes of omission by the Active obedience of Christ only, whereas the Scripture teacheth that without bloodshedding there is no remission.

I answer, only is your owne, none of Mr. Walker's, and though it be given to the blood of Christ as justification is, it is by a Synecdoche, as Calvyn and others use to speake; his Active righteousnesse is not excluded. It was the precious blood of Christ as a Lambe without spot. Yea, his sufferings even to death were his obedience.

Still you must remember that there be what is debitis in esse, to life, for which there is provided the active obedience of Christ, the Church is holy, unreprovable, unblameable, wholly faire, not by taking away spots alone, but the beauty of Christ put on it.

You say he maketh the Active obedience of Christ penall and satisfactory, as if to live righteously and holy here had been a punishment, when as himself saith it was his meane.

Sir, what if he had said so? It was no less to take man's nature to be made under the Law. It was the becoming posture of him that was rich, his humiliation and abasement.

Your selfe say, *it cannot be denied in all this, but that the Active obedience of Christ may in some sense and respect be called satisfactory too, or concurring and falling in with its influence into the blood or death of Christ, &c.*

Your reason, *it was his meat, &c.* is a truth of Gods whole will in his hand. It was his meat to doe; I, and to suffer; he did it willingly, which yet you confess was pernall.

3. You say, *the worst is, he divideth the satisfaction of Christ into parts, and utterly destroyeth and abolisheth the infiniteness thereof: for what may be divided must needs be finite, and that which is the part of another cannot be infinite.*

And I pray you, are they not distinguishable into Active and Passive? either they are, and differ, or are the same; and why doe you establishing the one (if you doe so) dispute against the other? is it not by both if they be inseparable and not to be divided?

Neither doth division of Christ himselfe, or doing and suffering abolish the infiniteness of Christ. There are in him distinct two natures, three offices, body and soule, his Active obedience hath parts, and by parts were his sufferings made a whole. All which stand with Christs infinite nature, and the infinite value of his satisfaction.

And what doe you excluding Active obedience, which yet you confess to be in a sens satisfaction, and give all to what is Passive?

Mr. Walker making our righteousness to consist in the whole righteousness of Christ is farther from division, less destructive then your practise, denying and rejecting the Active obedience as the object of faith in justification.

Our objections urged, p. 98. are trifling impertinencies, grieving your selfe, separating them, not Mr. Walker who is for the whole obedience of Christ.

Amongst them there is one passage to be taken notice

of as a glosse corrupting the text, the text is, *If righteousnesse be by the Law, Christ died in vaine, Gal. 2. 21.* Your glosse, that is in true of the Law performed by Christ or well as by men themselves, and then if the righteousnesse of the world be by the All iute obedience of Christ his death must needs be in vaine.

This is but a corruption of the text. The scope is, justification is not by mans personall obedience to the Law, and that if man had beene able to obey perfectly, the death of Christ had beene vaine; man not being able, but being a transgressor, Christs death is necessary, which doth not exclude his obedience to the Law for us, Christs death doth not (alone taken) make us just, as is required, and thus is it by our Surety supplied.

Your selfe say it is satisfaction in a sense, and to fall in with death, so farre righteousnesse is by the Law, Christs obedience unto the same.

You must acknowledge Christ a fulfiller of the Law, and an establisfer of it this way, and that faith in Christ doth not make the Law of God of none effect, as the word speaketh, and learned Expositors, of which before. And when as workes or the righteousnesse of the Law are excluded, it is not Christ, but a mans owne.

Our Church in the Homily putteth Christs death as a ransome, and yet addes, *who besides this ransome fulfilled the Law for us perfectly.* It requireth on Christs part justice, that is satisfaction to Gods justice, or the price of our redemption, by the offering of his body and shedding of his bloud, with fulfilling of the Law perfectly and throughly— So that in him our justification is not onely Gods mercy and grace, but also his justice, which the Apostle calleth the justice of God, and it consisteth in paying our ransome and fulfilling of the Law, and so the grace of God doth not shun out the justice of God in our justification, but onely shuntesth out the justice of man, that is to say, the justice of our workes, as to be merits or deserving our justification: thus our Church in the Homily.

That which you call your last labour, p. 98. is but trifling, such at least is the Livery you give the learned men who

who use the figure *Metamorphosis*. And that of *wilfull men and impudent spirits*, and that the bare laying downe the words is enough, and that Mr. Walker hath ratified it. All these are but trifling, and so I passe them. Let us come to something.

You say, concerning those testimonies in general, I desire to propound but this one consideration, whether it be probable, &c. That so many learned interpreters through so many generations, expounding a Scripture which they conceive Tropically, should none of them give warning, or so much as take notice of a Tropicall expression, but deliver their minds in the same words, wherein in the Trope shall lie.

Sir, I answer. First, the thing may be done by many Ancient and later Divines too, and those never the wiser that neglect the search of them, out of conceit of their owne great light.

Our learned (*exceptis* before named) to a man have expressed themselves for the Relative sense and faiths justifying as an instrument, and the challenge is in Print many yeares agone to *Berius* bragging of testimony to name *vel unum*, as much, or little, as one expresse place or Doctor for the contrary. For ours there are testimonies enough before. *Romanists* themselves, as you for a proper sense, confess Protestants to be for that which is Tropicall, when as some urge difference amongst us, ours answer there is none. You were not borne, nor your by-way observed by those that were curious to object the same. Doctor *Davenant* cleareth *Luther* by the *Jesuite Vasques*. P. 352. And to that which is maine in our busynesse of them of those who teach the obedience and righteousness of Christ imputed to be the formall cause of justification he faith,

But this is the common sentence of all ours neither if we respell the thing it selfe, is there any one that wrote it, or thought otherwise. One may be confident of it in his judgement, he knew none of ours, if there were, they are without, indeed yours is but of

yester-day amongst us. And shall we now thinke they held your proper sente? *Iudicem Apellam non ego.*

Whereas you persist in the contrary, Mr. Walker hath given testimonies, and many more may be given to fill books.

For Baer I wonder you mention him, when as your Mr. Wotton speaking of his faith,

Quem ego hujus de imputatione opinio- *Whom I persuade my selfe to have*
nis autorem vult mihi persuadeo. Peri. bene the Author of this opinion of
2. I. 1. c. 14. p. 170. *imputation. Where also you may*

reade his exposition of that Article in the *Augustine* confession, in these words, in the conference at *Ratisbon*, Anno

1546.

Quia hac fide apprehendimus justitiam perfectam Christi, ideo Apostolus dixit credenti in eum qui justificat impium, fidem eius reputari in justitiam, fidem sc. apprehendentem justitiam Christi, id est, ipsam Christi justitiam,

*That is, because by this faith we apprehend the perfect righteousness of Christ, therefore the Apostle said, to him that believeth in him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith to be reputed of righteousness; faith, forsooth, apprehending the righteousness of Christ, that is, the righteousness of Christ is selfe. Where Mr. Wotton is willing to use the Popish shift of a meritorious cause, if it would serve, as you before. I finde Baer also amongst those of *Sybrandus*, and his writings are not now in mine hand.*

Constat ergo ex his Christum impleuisse Legem, & hunc esse perfectionem in orbe omnium, Dec. 3. s. 6. p. 177. 1. He inferreth it from the text, Rom. 8. 4.

In eo est dilectio Dei perfectissima & justitia per omnia absolutissima, & hanc nobis imperfectissimis communicat gratis, si credamus; condonat enim nobis peccata facta pro nobis expiatio, & communicat nobis suam justitiam quae imputata vocatur, ex 2 Cor. 5. ult. & Rom. 4. creditur Abraham, etc. Fide enim comprehendimus Christum quem credimus abolutissime pro nobis Deo satisfacti, atque Deum nobis pacatum est propter Christum, & nostri Christi;

justitiam

For Bullinger I have read in him, It is certaine therefore from these, Christ to have fulfilled the Law, and him to be the perfection of all men in the world. And then:

In him there is the most perfect love of God, and righteousness every way most absolute, and he doth freely communicate this to us that are most imperfect, if we believe; for he pardoneth to us our sinnes, being made for us an expiation, and communicateth to us his righteousness which is called imputation, (which he proveth 2 Cor. 5. ult.

3. v. & Rom. 4. Abraham believed, &c. For by faith we comprehend Christ, whom we believe most absolutely to have satisfied for us, and God to be at peace with us for Christ, and the righteousness of Christ to be freely imputed unto us, or our own (and truly our own, by his gift) because we be now the children of God.

When or no mortall man exactly satisfied the Law for himself, how therefore to justice is promised life and salvation to such as observe the Law? p. 179.

No wonder, for that promise respecteth that perfect righteousness of Christ which is imputed unto us.

Whence it is now cleare those sayings of the Lord Christ to be equivalent, He that believeth in me hath eternall life, and, If thou wilt enter into life, keepe the Commandements.

I therefore the whole abrogation of the decalogue, consisteth in those things of which we have spoken now before, that Christ in faith is our perfect righteousness.

And now Reader see how truly he faith of his Authors, that they exclude all other things whatsoever, without exception, from this imputation; and thus for this demonstration, as you are pleased to call it, we shall see more afterward.

Come we now to your second demonstration, which as farre as it will reach, say you, makes the matter greater than contradiction, that the Authors could not in their expositions and commentaries possibly take the word Faith & Believing in a figurative sense, but in a proper.

Let us see this Demonstration.

Because (say you) the word faith takes in a figurative sense for the righteousness of Christ, is partly manifest and open blasphemous, partly most ridiculous absurd; for example, Luther on Gal. 3. 6. Deus reputat istam imperfectam fidem, &c. for perfect righteousness, if by faith there we understand the righteousness of Christ, and not faith properly, he makes Luther an execrable

*justitiam gratis imputari tanquam nostram
(It revera ex donacione nostra) quia nos sumus iam filii Dei.*

Quando nullus mortalium exacte satisficerit Legi per se, quomodo igitur promittitur justitia, vita & salus servantibus Legem? nimis respicit ea promissio ipsam Christi perfectam justitiam que imputatur nobis. lb.

Unde iam clarum est istas Christi Domini sententias equipollere. Qui credit in me habet vitam eternam; & Si vis ingredi in vitam serva mandata, &c.

Tota ergo decalogi abrogatio in illis de quibus iam ante diximus confitit, quod sc. Christus in fide est perfecta justitia nostra. p. 179.

execrable blasphemers, for he calleth the righteousness of Christ imperfect righteousness. Illiricus a beggerly faith, &c. and therefore.

1. I answer that *Calvyn* and *Luther* take the word, faith, in this point of justification, as an instrument Relatively, figuratively, and that it justifieth as it taketh in its object Christ and his righteousness, and not in a proper sense, as a worke considered in and by it selfe, and that they teach the righteousness of Christ to be that which being imputed by God, and applied by our faith, to be that whereby we be just before God, is as evident and cleare as the Sunne in the firmament shining at noone day.

2. That the rankest enemies of Gods grace, whether *Arminians* or *Papists*; yet, never (knowing the same) were so inconsiderate to lay such a charge on them.

3. That it is an injurious kinde of dealing with Authors, to force them to speake against manifest expressures of themselves in their writings, a miserably poore shift, a signe that a man is neere driven in a strait, desperate, especially in writing to doe so. It were more modesty to say we understand them not, or deny their authority with reason, to say they erre, then thus as it were to snarle at them, and bite them.

4. When as we speake of faith that it is imperfect, beggerly, leprous, we speake of it (though an instrument) as it is in it selfe, and therefore taking it so, deny it to justifie as a worke, or for its worth, and say it hath need of justification it selfe; and that in justice God cannot account it for the righteousness of the Law, we speake of it as of an hand that receiveth riches. Whether it be weake, or uncleane, or leprous, so it affordeth a strong argument against your proper sense, and a necessity that when as it is laid to justifie that it should doe so in respect to the object it is employed about, the righteousness of Christ which it receiveth.

And when as by a Trope the righteousness of Christ is signified, or taken in with faith the instrument, there is done

none that saith either that faith is the righteousness of Christ, or whatsoever is predicated of the instrument faith, is true of the object of it the righteousness of Christ. When you prove these, Christ shall be and his righteousness as is said of faith, imperfect, leprous, &c. till then, though the faith that is imputed be so, it will not be true of the object, imperfection and leprosie is its owne. Justification properly is the effect of Christ's righteousness, which is given to faith not as imperfect or weake, or strong, but as an hand receiving the righteousness of Christ, which applied, justifieth.

Thus as I am able I have indeavoured to answer you, not leaving willingly as much as one passage unanswered, and now may say, what you say notwithstanding or doe against Mr. Walker, or the cause, *He may still have Petiade stomachum cedere nescii.* The stouter a man is for the truth, I say the truth, the greater is his glory.

For a close, give me leave to the many testimonies used already, to addle some more out of some learned moderne writers, by which the Reader may see whether the proper sense of faith, or that which is Relative to its object the righteousness of Christ hath their constant patronage, and whether we be justified by faith in a proper sense, or the imputation of the righteousness of Christ.

Luther shall lead the way. He to the *Galatians* hath many places. I in my reading him over have observed these, as he is in *English*.

I have another righteousness and life, which is Christ the son of God. Wherefore Christ apprehended by faith, and dwelling in the heart, is the true Christian righteousness, for the which God counteth us righteous, and giveth us eternall life. Whosoever shall be found having this confidence in Christ, apprehended in the heart, him God will account for righteous; this is the meane, and this is the merit, whereby we attaine remission of sins and righteousness. Because then hast laid hold on Christ by faith, strong whom thou art made righteous. P. 8. 1.

P. 55. Col. 2.

P. 66. 1.

P. 66. 2.

P. 70. 2.

We are indeed justified and made righteous in Christ.

And teacheth what true Christian righteousness is, namely

X that

excretable blasphemers, for he calleth the righteousness of Christ imperfect righteousness. Illiricus a beggerly faith, &c. and therefore.

1. I answer that *Calvyn* and *Luther* take the word, faith, in this point of justification, as an instrument Relatively, figuratively, and that it justifieth as it taketh in its object Christ and his righteousness, and not in a proper sense, as a worke considered in and by it selfe, and that they teach the righteousness of Christ to be that which being imputed by God, and applied by our faith, to be that whereby we be just before God, is as evident and cleare as the Sunne in the firmament shining at noone day.

2. That the rankest enemies of Gods grace, whether *Arminians* or *Papists*; yet, never (knowing the same) were so inconsiderate to lay such a charge on them.

3. That it is an injurious kinde of dealing with Authors, to force them to speake against manifest exprestures of themselves in their writings, a miserably poore shifte, a signe that a man is neere driven in a strait, desperate, especially in writing to doe so. It were more modesty to say we understand them not, or deny their authority with reason, to say they erre, then thus as it were to snarle at them, and bite them.

4. When as we speake of faith that it is imperfect, beggerly, leprous, we speake of it (though an instrument) as it is in it selfe, and therefore taking it so, deny it to justifie as a worke, or for its worth, and say it hath need of justification it selfe; and that in justice God cannot account it for the righteousness of the Law, we speake of it as of an hand that receiveth riches. Whether it be weake, or uncleane, or leprous, so it affordeth a strong argument against your proper sense, and a necessity that when as it is said to justifie that it should doe so in respect to the object it is employed about, the righteousness of Christ which it receiveth.

And when as by a Trope the righteousness of Christ is signified, or taken in with faith the instrument, there is none

none that saith either that faith is the righteousness of Christ, or whatsoever is predicated of the instrument faith, is true of the object of it the righteousness of Christ. When you prove these, Christ shall be and his righteousness as is said of faith, imperfect, leproous, &c. till then, though the faith that is imputed be so, it will not be true of the object, imperfection and leprosie is its owne. Justification properly is the effect of Christ's righteousness, which is given to faith not as imperfect or weake, or strong, but as an hand receiving the righteousness of Christ, which applied, justifieth.

Thus as I am able I have indeavoured to answer yon, not leaving willingly as much as one passage unanswered, and now may say, what you say notwithstanding or doe against Mr. Walker, or the cause, *He may still have Pelias from acum cedere nescii.* The stouter a man is for the truth, I say the truth, the greater is his glory.

For a close, give me leave to the many testimonies used already, to adde some more out of some learned moderne writers, by which the Reader may see whether the proper sense of faith, or that which is Relative to its object the righteousness of Christ hath their constant patronage, and whether we be justified by faith in a proper sense, or the imputation of the righteousness of Christ.

Luther shall lead the way. He to the *Galatians* hath many places. I in my reading him over have observed these, as he is in *Eng'ish*.

I have another righteousness and life, which is Christ the son P. 8. 1.
of God. Wherefore Christ apprehended by faith, and dwelling P. 65. Col. a.
in the heart, is the true Christian righteousness, for the which
God counteith us righteous, and giveth us eternal life. Whosoever P. 66. 1.
shall be found having this confidence in Christ, apprehended
in the heart, him God will account for righteous; this is the
meane, and this is the merit, whereby we attaine remission of sins
and righteousness. Because thou hast laid hold on Christ by faith,
through whom thou art made righteous.

We are indeed justified and made righteous in Christ. P. 70. 2.

And teacheth what true Christian righteousness is, namely

P. 82. 1. that righteousness whereby Christ liveth in us, and not that which is in our person.

P. 83. 2. Now, because Christ liveth in me, therefore looke what grace righteousness, &c. is in me, it is his, and yet notwithstanding the same is mine also by that unspeakable union and communion which is through faith, by the which Christ and I are made one body in spirit.

P. 91. 1. For as much as Christ liveth in me, it followeth, that as I must needs be partaker of grace, righteousness, &c. I am now one with Christ, that is to say, Christ's righteousness, &c. are mine.

P. 89. L. Christ died for sinnes that he might make us righteous, therefore when I seeke my selfe a sinner, through Adams transgression, why shold I not say that I am made righteous through the righteousness of Christ.

P. 112. 1. I will account and pronounce thee as righteous.

 Ib. But because I am covered under the shadow of Christ's wing, as the Chichen under the wing of the Hen.

 Ib. Through whom we are made perfect, sinne is pardoned for Christ's sake in whom thou believest, who is perfectly just, whose Righteousness is thy righteousness, and thy sinne is his sinne.

P. 113. 1. For all the promises past are contained in Christ to come, therefore as well Abraham as the other Fathers, are made righteous by faith in Christ, they by faith in him to come, we by faith in him now present.

P. 116. 2. Therefore all the world is blessed, that is, receiveth imputation of righteousness, if it believe as Abraham did.

P. 119. 1. Therefore to say that the Nations are blessed, is nothing else but that righteousness is freely given to them, or that they are counted righteous before God.

P. 119. 2. Moreover, if the Nations be blessed, that is to say, accounted righteous before God, it followeth that they are free from sinne and death; and are made partakers of righteousness, &c. by faith in Christ.

 Ib. Gen. 12. 9. speaketh of such a blessing as belongeth to imputation of righteousness, which is available before God, and redeemeth from the curse of sinne, now this blessing is received only by faith, for the text saith, Abraham believed, &c.

To make us righteous before God there is a farre more excellent price required, which is neither the righteousness of man, or the Law. Here we must have Christ to blesse us, &c. as Abraham had. P. 150. 1.

Whom Abraham himselfe by faith did apprehend, and through him was blessed. So making an happy change with us, he tooke upon him our sinfull person, and gave unto us his innocents and victorious person, wherewith we being now clothed, are freed from the curse of the Law. He that doth so (believe) hath the innocency and victory of Christ, by faith only therefore we are made righteous, for faith laieth hold on this innocency and victory of Christ. P. 159. 1. Ib. P. 140.

The Law threatneth unto thee death, &c. but be not afraid, fly not away, but stand fast, I supply and performe all things for thee, I satisfie the Law for thee. P. 160. 3.

Therefore there must come a farre other Mediator than Moses, which may satisfie the Law. P. 161. 1.

The putting on of Christ, consisteth in putting on Christ's innocency, his righteousness, his wisdom, &c. P. 175. 1.

But Christ himselfe is our garment, &c. to be apparelled with Christ is not, &c. but with an incomparable gift, that is to say, with remission of sinnes, righteousness, peace, — and Christ himselfe. Ib.

But you are clothed with a new garment, to wit, with the righteousness of Christ, w^tch when we are apparelled with Christ so with the robe of our righteousness, and salvation, &c. P. 176. 1.

For as much as Christ pleaseth God, and we are in him, we also please God and are holy. P. 183. 2.

In him doe I believe, if I be a sinner and erre, he is righteous and cannot erre. He with all that is in him is made unto me of Gods righteousness. P. 189. 1. P. 145. 1.

Faith Gods gift and worke in our hearts, which therefore justifieth us, because it apprehendeth Christ our Redemper. P. 47. 1.

We say faith apprehendeth Christ, which is the summe, which adorneth and furnisheth faith, at the colour the wall. P. 65. 1.

Very summe and perfection of faith. P. 65. 1.

Faith therefore justifieth, because it apprehendeth and perfecteth in measure, evn Christ present. P. 65. 1.

P. 67. 1. To him that believeth, sinne is pardoned, and righteousnesse imputed.

Calvine.

In Rom. 3. 24. God to be without Christ always angry with us, that we are reconciled by him whilist we are accepted in his righteousnesse, &c.

Ib. By faith we come to the possession of that benefit.

But by naming blood alone he would not exclude other parts of redemption. But rather under one part to comprehend the whole summe. So by a Symedoche the whole expiation is named.

For Christ should be in vaine given to us for righteousnesse, unlesse thers shall be fruition by faith.

Ad ver. 31. When we come to Christ, first in him there is found the exalt righteouſſeſſe of the Law, which by imputation is made ours.

Ib. Neither doe we otherwise attaine righteousnesse, but because, as it is brought unto us in the promise of the Gospel, so we see the possession of it as it were by faith.

From whence we gather that it is not disputed what manner of men, men are in themselves, but in what place God accounteth them, not that—but because when the cause is sought why God loveth us, and acknowledgeth us as just, there is a necessity that Christ should come forth who may clothe us with his righteousnesse.

For (that a man may be justified) there is required perfell and numeris suis omnibus, i. every way consummated obedience as the promise of the Law soundeth, Lev. 18. 5. Those that are already apparellid with the righteousnesse of Christ, they not onely have God favourable to them, but to their works, whose spots and wrinckles are covered by the holinesse of Christ, that they come not to account, if so the righteousnesse of faith be the only cause why works are accounted just.

But by Christ's righteousnesse we are another way restored to salvation, neither is it therefore accounted to us, because it is within us: but because we possess Christ himself with all his goods, given to us by his Fathers bountie, the free gift of righteousnesse signified imputation.

But indeed that we may come to the participation of the

Ad Rom. 5. 17

& 19. ver. 1.

grace of Christ, it behoveth that we be inset into him by faith. Ad ver. 17.

That thou mayest enjoy Christ's righteousness, it is necessary that thou be a believer, because by faith we attaine fellowship with him. Ib.

But it behoveth us to be just if we be accepted to him.

Ad ver. 18.

When he pronounceth us to be constituted just by the obedience of Christ, hence we gather, Christ in that he satisfied his Father, to have attained righteousness for us; whence it followeth, that the quality of righteousness is in Christ, but that which is proper to him to be accounted to us. He interpreteth also what is the righteousness of Christ, when he calleth it obedience. Where I beseech you let us observe what we must bring into the sight of God if we would be justified by works: forsith the righteousness of the Law — every way absolute.

Ad ver. 19.

For see therefore us to be altogether excluded from the righteousness of works, and therefore that we fly to the righteousness of Christ, because there can be none in us.

Ad Rom. 8. 3.

Which is especially necessary to be knowne, because we be never clothed with the righteousness of Christ unless we first surely know.—

Now he sheweth the manner whereby the heavenly Father restoreth to us righteousness by his sonne.—

There is no doubt his righteousness to be called; which is his gift. Ad c. 10. 3.

But we have elsewhere said, how men put on his righteousness by faith; forsith because Christ's righteousness is imputed to them.

But after he cast all under guilt, he substituted a new righteousness in Christ. — Which being given freely, is accepted by faith.

He excellently taketh away this scruple, when as from the very In ver. 5.
Doctrine of the Law he establisheth the righteousness of faith.

The place is out of Lev. 18. 5. where the Lord promiseth eternal life to those who shall keep his Law.

And so by their owne deselb constrained they might learne to fly to Christ, 1 Cor. 1. 30. he was made — whereby he satisfieth us in his name to be accepted of God, because by his death he hath expiated our finnes, and his righteousness should

Ib.

In 1 Cor. 1. 30.

be imputed to us. For when as the righteousnesse of faith consisteth in remission of sinnes and free acceptation, we obtaine both by him.

Now he more plainerely teacheth us before touch'd, that then God is favourable to us when as he acknowledgeth us for just, for shife twoe are all one, that we are accepted of God, and that we are reputed just. Righteousnesse here is taken for acceptation, because Christ's righteousnesse is accounted to us.

How are we just before God? forsooth, as Christ was a sinner, for after a manner he tooke upon him our person, that he might be made guilty in our sinnes, and might be judged as a sinner, not with his owne, but others fault, when as himselfe shoulde be pure, and free from all fault, and shoulde under-goe the punishment not due to himselfe but us. So forsooth are we just in him, not because by our owne works we may satisfie the judgement of God, but because we are accounted the righteousnesse of God, which we put on by faith than it may be ours.

Ad Gal. 3. 6.

When as he saith, that he believed was imputed to him for righteousnesse, he therein signifieth him to be just who is accounted such with God, but when as men have not righteousnesse laid up in themselves, they attaine it by imputation, because God doth counteth unto them for righteousnesse; therefore we are said to be justified by faith, not because he transfuseth the habit or quality of faith into us, but because we are accepted of God. But why is so great honour given unto it that it shoulde be called the cause of our righteousnesse?

15

We must know it to be onely the instrumentall cause, for speaking properly it is nothing else but Gods gracious acceptation, in which our salvation is laid. But because the Lord in giving unto us a testimony of his love and favour by the Gospel, communicateth unto us that righteousnesse which I called it, therefore we receive the same by faith.

Therefore, when as we give to faith mans justification, we dispute not of the principall cause, onely we observe the manner whereby men come unto true righteousnesse, this righteousnesse is a mere gift of God.—but it is possessed onely by faith.

I therefore all those phrases of speech are as one, that we are justified by grace, Christ to be our righteousnesse, Gods mercy to be the cause of our righteousnesse, righteousnesse to be attained for

us by the death and resurrection of Christ. Righteousness to be bestowed on us by the Gospel, that we by faith obtain righteousness.

We have put you in minde, that those that are just by faith, that they are just out of themselves in Christ, not because we have praise of holyness among men, are we accounted just before God—but when we bring to him the perfect obedience of the Law—because we have it not in our selves, God giveth it us freely.

I passe what Mr. Walker hath gathered out of these and other Authors, and Printed, and many testimonies of others, which I truly have by me already gathered, which needed but transcription. I will content my selfe with the testimonies of some few your selfe name, and but a few, that the world may see what faith is due to you in citing Authors. I confess I have not all their writings by me, either to examine your testimonies, or bring them for my selfe, so farre as I have will give a sufficient taste to the Reader.

For once I referre me to what was observed before.

And so for Bullinger, and the Reader may turne to Mr. Walker.

Luther on that very text you cite, hath these passages.

Gal. 3. 6.

Because I am covered under the shadow of Christs wings.

Flying to Christ our Mediator and Reconciler, through whom we are made perfect; Through him we have all things who onely doth supply whatsoever is wanting in us. For Jesus Christ's sake in whom we doe beleve.

It is forgiven thee for Christ's sake who is perfectly just, whose righteousness is thy righteousness, and thy sinne is his sinne.

Christ which was given for us, whom we apprehend, that causeth that God doth account that faith though it be imperfect for perfect righteousness.

This object I bring scit from the Father pleased you, and because you have apprehended and imbraced this object, wherefore ye please him.

*Numbing committib betweene (me a sinner and Christ's love) but
Christ*

Christ the Mediator. — *Imputation of righteousness is also necessary, sinnes do remaine in us which God doth utterly hate, therefore it is necessary that we shoulde have imputation of righteousness, which we obtaine through Christ, and for his sake wher he is given unto us, and received of us by faith.*

The reconciler (whence sinne is no sinne, damnable and ne) is the Mediator betwixt God and man, even the man Jesus Christ, Rom. 8. 1.

Judge now whether he excluded the object or no, whether he taketh it not in as what is apprehended and applied by faith.

Peter Martyr hath these words.

Quin etiam fides ipsa, si qua nostrum opus est consideretur, ea justificari non possumus, sicut cum opus sit & mancum & imperfectum, longe deterius quam requirit. Sed illa justificati dicimus qua promissiones Dei, & Christi justitiam meritaria per ipsam apprehendimus & nobis applicamus. Loc. Com. de justif. Sct. 8.

But also faith it selfe, if it be considered at our worke, we cannot be justified with it, seeing it is a worke both lame and imperfect, much worse then (God) requireth; but we are said to be justified with it, as by it we apprehend the promises of God, and the righteousness of Christ and his merits, and apply them to our selves.

Fingas tibi mendici hominis seddissimam & leprosam manum, qua capiat elemosynam ab offertore: certe mendicus ille a sedditate sua lepra manus hanc quamquam iuvatur, sed elemosynam qualicunque accipit. Sct. 8.

profite of his hand, but by whatsoever hand it doth receive. Ib.

Qui in scipio Christum haberet, omnius justitiam haberet, de illo enim Paulus scribit ad Cor. 1. c. 2. qui factus est nobis sapientia, justitia, &c. Sct. 52.

Hic (Phil. 3. 9.) can justitiam que est ex operibus & ex Lege appellat suam: eam vero que est ex fide quamquam maxime optat appellat justitiam Jesu Christi. Sct. 52.

Creditur Abraham believed, &c. But what did he believe? for sooth him, &c. At ille quid creditit? hoc sc. semen sibi dandum esse, unicum, yea illud ut Parus interpretatur, in quo omnes nationes essent benedicti, quod est Christus Jesus, Gen. 15. 6. Gal. 3. 16, Sct. 53.

Suppose to thy selfe the most filthy and leprous hand of some begger, with which he may receive an almes from him that offerte it; surely that begger is not helped from the filthiness or leprosy of his hand, but by whatsoever hand it doth receive. Ib.

He that bath Christ in himselfe, he bath righteousness altogether, for of him Paul writeth ad Cor. 1. 1. who was made to us wisdom, righteousness, &c.

Here be calleth that righteousness which is of works and the Law, his; but that which is of faith, and which he most wishest, he calleth it the righteousness of Jesus Christ.

this only seede to be given unto him; that is, as Paul interpreteth, in which all Nations were to be blessed, which is Christ, Gen. 15.

6. Gal. 3. 16. Pareus.

What did Abraham believe? to wit, Gods consolatory Sermon of Gods singular grace—of seed to be borne of Sarah—for the Apostle calleth the promised seed, expressly Christ. Neither can it be doubted the promised seede which Abraham believed to agree with foregoing and following promises of seede and blessing of all Nations by it: and then Abrahams faith was a generall faith or Catholique (as Sopisters call it) assenting to every word of God. But also speciaall resting on the promise given of seede, which is Christ. So Ambrose, Abraham believed God: What did he believe? that he was to have seede, that is, a Sonne, in whom all Nations should be justified. Therefore Abrahams was founded in Christ. The Apostle will more clearly declare this faith about the end of the chapter expressly teaching, Justifying faith ought to be fastned &c. in the death and resurrection of Christ. Pareus, p. 268.

And in the former page, Now on the contrary, he proverbith Abraham to be justified by faith, that is, with righteousnesse freely imputed to the believer.

And there having denied faith as a vertue to justifie, though it be most excellent, &c. Abraham is proposed not as working—but as by faith freely receiving righteousnesse, p. 270.

Againe, When faith is said to be imputed for righteousnesse it is not to be understood but Relatively, because righteousnesse shall be freely imputed to the believer, or because the believer of grace shall be reputed just.

I will name but one place more now of Pareus, he is often before cited, who when in answering Bellarmine, he had said of Luther *but in a metaphysicke sense he said faith, than is, Christ apprehended by faith, to be our righteousnesse.*—Addeth.

Y

Which

Quid creditit abraham in cpte, concionem illam consolatoriam de Dei gratia singulari de semine nascituro ex Sara.— Apostolus enim promissum semen expresse dicit esse Christum. Nec dubitari potest, feminis promissionem, cui credidisse Abraham dicitur, coherere cum promissionibus antegressis & subsecutis de semine & benedictione omnium gentium per illud. In locum.

See Pareus in cap. 4. dub. 3.
Justitia ergo habet imputata credenti, idque dicens Scripturæ testimonioum.

Nunc contra probat Abrahamum justificatum esse fide, hoc est, justitia gratis imputata credenti, idque dicens Scripturæ testimonioum.

Sed Meronimico sensu dixit fidem, id est, Christum habere apprehensionem etenim quam justitiam.

Qcum sensum metonymicum si oppugnat Adversarius, certe non Lutherum impugnat sed Spiritum sanctum blasphemat, qui Christum expresso vocat iustitiam nostram, Jer. 23. 6. & 1 Cor. 1. 30. Cestig. I. 3. c. 4. p. 418. § 19.

Which figurative sense called Metonymia, if the Adversary opposeth, surely he opposeth not Luther, but blasphemeth the holy Ghost, who calleth Christ expressly our righteousness, as Jer. 23. 6. & 1 Cor. 1. 30.

Calvin followeth, in both places mentioneth the object. Abraham by believing doth no other thing then embrace the grace tendered to him, by which he meaneth the promises, Christ that feed especially and his righteousness, and that is infolded in the goodness of God which it is said to apprehend.

And on the same place. But by faith they borrow from elsewhere what is wanting to them, and therefore it is openly called imputed righteousness by faith.

That latter is to be referred the promise of future feed.

Where the cause is sought. Why— he acknowledgeth us for righteous, it is necessary that Christ come forth, who clotheth us with his righteousness.

Faith adorneth us with anothers righteousness, which is begotten of God.

Faith bore hath relation and respect to such a word of God, which men believing can rest in it. What the promises are be sheweth towards the end of his Commandement at that place, as Pareus and Martir before.

Which righteousness seeing men have not placed in themselves, they obtaine it by imputation.

To that question, why is so great honour given to faith, that it is called the cause of our righteousness? he answereth.

First, we must know it is onely the instrumentall cause, for to speake properly, our righteousness is no other then Gods free acceptance, in which our safety is founded.

But because the Lord in giving us a testimony of his love and homines acquiescere in ipso possunt. Quum autem iustitiam in se repositam non habent homines, imputatione hanc adipiscuntur. Primo sciendi est esse causam duxisse instrumentalem, nam proprie loquendo iustitia nostra nihil aliud est quam gratia. Dicit acceptio iusta fundata est nostra falsus. Sed quia Dominus testimonium nobis amoris sui & gracie per Evangelium rededicato, illam quam dixi iustitiam nobis communicat, ideo huc illam precipitum.

favoured by the Gospel, doth communicate to us that righteousness
I called, therefore we receive it by faith.

Therefore when we give man justification to faith, we dispute not of
the principall cause, only we observe the manner by which men come to true
righteousness: For this righteousness is
Gods mere gift, not a quality which
may inheret in men, but is possessed only by faith.

We have therefore called to mind those
that are just by faith, are just out of
themselves, forsooth in Christ.

We are justified before God,
when we bring the perfect righteousness
of the Law, for righteousness is oppo-
sed to the transgression of the Law,
even in the least point, because we have it not in our selves, God
giveth it to us freely.

Abraham therefore is not justified—
but because he ingrazed the
grace of God trusting in the promised
Mediator in whom all Gods promises
are Yes and Amen.

Let the Reader observe but these passages on the same
place, and he may observe the vaine confidence of this
objection of Calvin, for his proper sense of faith, and oppo-
sition of the common tenet.

To Gualter, M. Wr. rightly willeth the Reader to see how
hardly we are put to it, when as you cite the bare words
themselves to prove your interpretation: for *Aretium* (for
I have not to examine by either *Musculus* or *Gualter*, or *Il-
lyrius*, &c.) Shal in the next place be considered.

The instrumentall cause is faith of
Jesus Christ, that is, that imputed
righteousness of God is applied to us by
faith in Christ.

It is called the instrument of justi-
fication, because the righteousness of
God is applied to us by faith.

Ergo cum fidei tribuumus hominis justifi-
cationem, non de causa principali disputa-
mus, sed tantum notamus modum quo per-
venient homines ad veram justitiam: justitia
enim haec est merita Dei donum, non qualis
tas quae in hominibus habet, sed fidei tantum
possidetur, &c.

Meminerimus ergo qui fidei justi sunt, eos
extrae justos esse, nempe in Christo.

Quam afferimus perfectam Legis obedien-
tiam, nam justitia transgressioni Legis etiam
in minimo apice opponitur, eam quia non
habemus in nobis, Deus nobis gratuito
donat.

Non ergo justificatus est Abraham, sed
quia Dei gratiam amplexus est fatus Medi-
atore promisso in quo omnes Dei promissio-
nes sunt: Etiam & Amen.

Quia cum Dei sit, & in Deo propri, nobis tamen imputatur & applicatur, adeo ut cum rei mortis simus, Deus nos absolvat à pena & justos pronuntiet imputata nobis sua iustitia; hinc imputata iustitia dici potest & gratuata. In Rom. 1.17.

Because seeing it is of God, and in God properly, yet it is imputed and applied to us, so as when we be guilty of death, God absolveth us from punishment, and may pronounce us just, his righteousness imputed unto us, bence may it be called imputed and free.

Quia nos justos facit haec imputativa est, nam aliena iustitia imputatur in justis per se, de hac loquitur in praesentia &c 1. vers. 17. e cap. 3. Rom. v. 24.

Considera non imputari peccarum quod inest homini, sic contra in justificatione imputari iustitiam que non inest homini. In c. 4 v. 6.

Fides igitur tam pia & tam firma pro iustitia ei imputata est, quia haec apprehendit misericordiam & propositam promissionem, hinc iustitia ei etiam imputatur. Ad v. 23.

Iustitia a Deo nobis factus est, quia in eo solo iusti habemur, & reputamur illius merito iusti. Ad 1 Cor. 1.30.

Ut nos efficeremur iustitia Dei, hoc est, iusti pronuntiantur, imputativa iustitia tanquam vestre ornaremar: dicitur autem iustitia Dei quia nostra non est sed precario, &c. Ad 2 Cor. 5.21.

It is called the righteousness of God because it is not ours but freely.

In ipso significat extra Christum nullam esse iustitiam qua nos possimus ornare, &c quia valeat in conspectum Dei. lb.

Ut perfecte Legem impleret quod nobis impossibile erat, deinde penas, &c. In Gal. 4.4

Because seeing it is of God, and in God properly, yet it is imputed and applied to us, so as when we be guilty of death, God absolveth us from punishment, and may pronounce us just,

his righteousness imputed unto us, bence may it be called imputed and free.

With which he maketh us just, this is imputative, for another's righteousness is imputed to men unjust by themselves, of this he speakeþ in the present place.

Consider (in justification) the finne which is in a man not to be imputed, so contrary in justification, that righteousness to be imputed which is not in man.

Faith therefore so bo'y and so firme is imputed to him for righteousness, because this apprehendeth the mercy and proposed promise, bence righteousness is imputed to him.

Christ is made to us of God righteousness, because in him alone we are accounted just, we are reputed just with his merit.

That we might be made the righteousness of God, that is, might be pronounced just, and be adorned with imputed righteousness as with a garment.

In him he signifieth that out of Christ there is no righteousness with which we can array our selves, and which availeth in the sight of God.

That he might perfectly fulfill the Law which was impossible to us, &c.

Thus

Thus for *Aretius*, who no whit digresseth from the former.

Ezea. And not rather an instrument onely and freely given us, with which, at an hand, we appre hend Christ our righteousness.

To righteousness, in those words there is a figure called *Hypal lage*.

For properly God is said to impute righteousness by faith, as by and by in the 6. & 11. v. what that righteousness is, is opened before us c. 1. vers. 17. and c. 3. vers. 20.

For Junius, the man might be thought either blind, or un sound in his principles that will but mention him.

By the promises which Abraham by faith imbraced, include that of Christ our seed.

Faith in the predicament of relation justifieth not as an habit — but by reason of its relative difference, which confidently imbraceth the gratuitous promise of righteousness and eternall life.

But relatively onely as it apprehendeth the merit of Christ, as the hand of the begger doth the almes.

The occasion therefore was this, that Abraham with a most simple faith did sit downe in those most simple promises of God, and laid hold of the same righteousness of God by the same faith, as it is imputed not to workers to a reward, but believers to righteousness and life, as the Apostle doth best of all interpret.

To conclude, that we may exponed this Metonymy by as evident a simily as we can. Faith is as a hand, or as a purse apprehending the treasure of grace which God in Jesus Christ exhibitteth to us.

Aut quasi fides sit illud quod nos justificat, ac non potius isti umenum donata atque quadem gratis nobis datum, quo tanquam manus quamplam Christum nostrum nolitram apprehendimus. In c. 4 ad Rom. 2.

Nam propriè dicitur Deus imputare justitiam per fidem, in mox, vers. 6. & 11. quid autem sit, supra ad 1. vers. 17. & 3. 20.

Fides in genere *τοῦ ἀρχῆς τοῦ*, non justificat in quantum habitus — sed ratione differentia relative quae gratuitam justitiae & vitæ æternæ promissionem fiducialiter amplectitur. Jan. Tlef. de justif. Stil. 1. 1.

Sed relative tantum quatenus meritum Christi apprehendit, tanquam manus mendicantis synnam. Scil. 1. 6.

Oeatio igitur haec fuit, quod Abraham fide simplicissima, acqueverit simplicibus illis Dei promissionibus, justitiamque Dei eadem ad mercedem, sed creditibus ad justitiam & vitam imputatur quemadmodum Apostolus optime interpretatur. In Gen. 15.

Denique ut Metonymiam hanc quam evidenterissimo possimus simili exponamus, fides est tanquam manus aut tanquam loculus apprehendens thesaurum gratiae quem nobis Deus exhibet in Christo Iesu. In Heb. 6. 11. 1.

Doctor *Abbot* is added in his defence of Mr. *Perkins*. I believe the words are there, though I cannot finde them, and have foure times inquired, and spent more time then will make an answer. Where we have first, *righteousnesse imputed without works*; secondly, *wher that is by your relation, the reputing of faith for righteousness*, for that thereby we obtaine remission and forgivensesse of sinnes.

And you conclude, *he that will undertake to divide this Author and the opinion we contend for, must be more severe then to give a man leave to be of his owne minde.*

I finde the words otherwise cited in your Master Mr. *Wotton*, and will say nothing to them, untill I finde them, but suspend.

But this I am confident of, that the Author no more favoureth your opinion, then any of those that are called your adversaries in this question; and who ever shall read his whole chapter, and consider whom he defendeth, and what against *Bishop*, shall see our arguments for the imputation of Christ's righteousness which you oppose proposid by Mr. *Perkins*, opposed in many things by Doctor *Bishop* the *Papist*, and made good against him by Dr. *Abbot*, who doth it as a sonne of the Church of England indeed. What he undertakes you may see, p. 381.

That our justification and righteousness before God standeth not in any inward vertues, &c. but in the imputation of Christ's obedience and righteousness made ours by faith, shall be proved to him, God willing, by better arguments then be shall be able to disprove.

In that place, for this by the way he nameth, 1 Cor. 1. 30. *But the Goffel techeseth us to acknowledge Christ immediatly and wholly our righteousness and salvation, in whom, and not in our selves, we are made the righteousness of God, that is, just in the sight of God, in that his obedience and righteousness performed and wrought in our name, and for our behoofe, is imputed unto us by faith in his bloud.*

1. Mr. *Perkins* argument is, *That which must be our righteousness before God, must satisfie the justice of the Law, which saith, Doe these things and thou shalt live.*

P. 381.
P. 383.

P. 384.

*But there is nothing that can satisfie that justice of the Law
but the righteousnesse and obedience of Christ. Ergo.*

P. 387.

This argument the Doctor defendeth.

He sheweth this Scripture meant of the *Morall-Law*.

P. 389.

Now Mr. Perkins to take away the opinion of our owne righteouſſeſſe, and to ſhew that we have no other but the righteouſſeſſe of Christ to rest ſafely upon, alleadgeth as Gregory doth, the rigour and ſeverity of Gods judgement which admitteth of nothing but what is exalt and perfect, according to the rule of juſtice preſcribed to us.

P. 356.

2. His ſecond argument is taken out of 2 Cor. 5. nlt. As Christ was made ſinne for us, ſo we are made the righteouſſeſſe of God in him. But Christ was made ſinne by the imputation of our ſinnes being moſt holy. Therefore a ſinner is made righteous, in that Christs righteouſſeſſe is imputed unto him.

P. 399.

Which are made good out of Anſelme, Auguſtine, and Hierome.

Where you shall finde a comparison made good againſt you.

P. 401. &c.

And, that anſwered that he was made ſinne not by imputation, but a Sacrifice. Where he demandeth why the Sacrifice of ſinne ſhould be called by the name of ſinne. See him who is large in ſpeaking therunto, out of the Trope and Fathers. There I finde Christ needed not for himſelfe to be made under the Law, for to performe the righteouſſeſſe thereof for his owne justification before God, being otherwife ſimply and abſolutely iust. But what he did he did it for our ſakes, that we thereby through faſth in him ſhould be justified in Gods sight.

P. 402. 403.

It followeth that the righteouſſeſſe of God muſt be understood of another righteouſſeſſe, which is that wherof the Apostle inſtructeth us, whereby the Lord imputeth righteouſſeſſe without workes, according to the words of David, &c.

Rom. 4. 6.

Ib.

Hilerto the Argument ſtandeth good. As Christ was made ſinne, ſo we are made righteouſſeſſe; Christ was made ſinne by the imputation of our ſinne, we are therefore made righteous by the imputation of his righteouſſeſſe.

P. 404.

Mr. Perkins his third Argument, is from Rom. 5. 19. As by the diſobedience of Adam, men were made ſinners, ſo

by

P. 404. by the obedience of Christ are they made righteous. But men are made sinners by the imputation of Adams sinne unto them, and not only by propagation of naturall corruption: Therefore by imputation of Christ's justice we are made righteous.

P. 405. The case is very cleare, that if we be sinners by the imputation of Adams sinne, then are we also righteous by the imputation of the righteousnesse of Christ.

Where he defendeth the imputation of Adams sinne, which he proveth against Bishop, (and Bellarmine himselfe somewhere, and you) out of Bellarmine citing Bernard for it, &c. and Augustine, p. 406. and Bernard, p. 407. and Chrysostome.

Now I pray thee Reader doe but judge whether this Doctor be of Mr. John Goodwines side, the opinion he contendeth for or against him, and never credit his testimony but on examination.

Doctor Preston maketh himselfe a stranger to the Tropicall interpretation of this Scripture, and improvesth it which is literally and proper, Treat. Allsuff. p. 12. & 13. In this sense faith is said to be imputed for righteousnesse. Abraham believed God Gen. 15. God indeed made the same proposition that he doth here for substance, he tells him what he would doe for him. And (saith the text) Abraham believed God, &c. Now it was accounted to him for righteousnesse, chiefly in this sense, as it is interpreted, Rom. 4. that this very taking of the promise, and his accepting of the Covenant, in that he did receive that which God gave, that put him within the Covenant, and therefore the Lord reckoned him a righteous man, even for that very acceptation and believing.

But that is not all, but likewise he accounteth faith to him for righteousnesse, because faith doth sanctifie and make a man righteous, &c. And then cry out evidence.

1. Doth the Doctor in all this discourse mention your proper sense?

2. Doth he establish it with an, and not the righteousnesse of Christ imputed?

3. Doth he not infold the object? He tells him what he would doe for him. So that all that he would doe for him was what he believed, on which imputation.

Your

Your selfe adde. *This very taking of the promise, and his accepting of the Covenant, and that he did receive that which God gave, was that wherefore the Lord reckoned him a righteous man.*

Is not here receiving the object, the promise, the covenant, and what God gave.

Is not Christ and his righteousness in all these, the seede, and the righteousness of God? If it be by receiving these, he was accounted just, these must not be excluded, this testimony is not against us, but for, and against you, who exclude these.

I will intreat the Reader to consider some of his particulars in the same worke.

*The Covenant is the ministracion of life and justification—
the Covenant of grace shewes him a righteousness to satisfie this
Law, that himselfe never wrought; shewes him a way of obtain-
ing pardon by the satisfaction of another.*

*Abraham saith the Lord, I will give thee a seed, and in
that seed both thou thy selfe, and all the Nations of the earth shall
be blessed.*

*There was no other way to make mankind partaker of the
Covenant of grace but onely by faith, by believing God, and ta-
king the promise and the gift of righteousness by Jesus Christ.*

*Because we believe the promises and the Covenant of grace,
therefore the Lord accepts us and counts us righteous.*

I would die that I might have Christ and his righteousness.

What difference is there now betwene him and the rest
of ours, who make the same things objects, and taken in
to make us just?

As that of Christ the seed, &c.

And though righteousness be not named there, it is in-
folded, and explained by the Prophets who reveale Christ
in the Covenant, the Lord our righteousness, and that
with him was to be brought in everlasting righteousness.
And it was granted when the Apostle laieth downe cir-
cumcision the signe and seale of the righteousness of faith:
faith reciveth righteousness which God promised, being
the Seale of the whole Covenant there is infolded the

New com.
P. 75.

P. 108.

P. 118. & 119.

P. 120.

P. 170.

seed, Christ's, and Christ's righteousness.

Mr. Forbes is the last, to which testimony I answer.

1. In the same place he saith, *That opinion of the Metonymicke sense of faith, agreeth with the truth of the matter in it selfe.*

2. When he saith that it is taken properly, yet it is with cautions. *If they that take it, serre not in the significacion of it, or the true sense of the imputation of it.*

3. And now let us consider what he doth farther.

He teacheth Christ's righteousness the onely matter of justification.

And the Lords imputing thereof the forme. That opinion (of Gods accepting our imperfect righteousness) can never be maintained with Gods honour.

That God justifieth us by accounting unto us Christ's obedience, which is in it selfe perfect righteousness, in such a sort as by this his imputation, it is ours as truly, and doth as truly cleare us before God as if it were our owne indeed, and we our selves had indeed performed it.

We must first have righteousness, for God justifieth no man that hath not righteousness. It is abomination, PROV. 17.15.

That opinion of those who place our righteousness in faith, properly taken, as it is the act of the heart without relation of it as an apprehending instrument unto Christ, is much more pernicious than the opinion of the Papists.

Nothing in Heaven or Earth in man or without man, is the matter of mans righteousness before God, except onely Christ and his obedience. Therefore it is said by the Apostle that he is made to us of God, &c. 1 Cor. 1. 30. and in the Prophet, Jer. 23. 6. and 33. 16. where also he urgeth that text, 2 Cor. 5. ult. and cleareth it, and Dan. 9. 24.

He urgeth Gods justice in justifying, and that if God should justifie us — by faith, as it is a worke or habit in us, God should never be scene to be just, &c. the Saints in Scripture have acknowledged their faith imperfect, whence he concludeth nothing can be our righteousness except Christ alone.

And now let the learned judge of those passages: *The cleare approbation of many Authors. The judgement of able, learned,*

C. 31. p. 161.

P. 163.

P. 164.

P. 169.

P. 80.

P. 85.

P. 90.

P. 98.

P. 1. trea.

ned, and unpartiall men is found in perfect concurrence with it :
And that.

*From about Luthers and Calvines time, the fairest stremes of
Interpreters runnes to water and refresh this interpretation.* P. 44.

And so whether you have cause of shame and blushing
for the same, and whether Mr. Walker had not cause of
blaming you for not being ashamed and blushing : I say
let the Reader judge.

Musculus is cleare for us, as by these testimonies trans-
cribed.

*Est quidem fides vera quedam qualitas in pectoribus
nostris, sed non justificat nos quatenus est nova qualitas, sed
quatenus gratiam Dei in Christo oblatam apprehendit, In
Rom. 3.24. &c.*

Quomodo illa in nobis impleta est per Christum, pri-
mum imputative, aliena justitia, que Christi est, adeoque
& nostra, quia caro sumus de carne ejus & os de ossibus illi-
us : hac ratione vere justi sumus, quia scilicet Christus no-
stra est justitia, sanctificatio, redemptio, 1 Cor. 1. ad Rom. c. 8.
vers. 3. &c.

Huc etiam facit quod justitiana fidei vocat justitiam Dei,
non ob hoc tantum, quod illa Deo tribuit justitiam, sed
& ob id quod nos per illius justitiam gratis in Christo fi-
lio ipsius justificamur per fidem, ita ut aliena justitia justi-
fimus, non propria. Maxima pessima est totius mundi, quod
hanc Dei justitiam tamē esse non agnoscit, per quam nos
justificemur, sed putat nostra ipsorum nos esse justitia sal-
vandos, electi vero non ita, unde quid Apostolus scribat, Ar-
bitror, inquit, omnia &c.— Ex eo vero non ascribemus no-
bis aliam justitiam quam eam quae est Dei per fidem Chri-
sti. In Rom. 10. 3.

Verum placuit antithesi uti peccatorum nostrorum &
justitiae Christi. Nos peccatores eramus, ille justus. Ut com-
mutatio fieret, nostra peccata imposuit filio justo, ac vicis-
sim justitiam illius communicavit nobis peccatoribus.
Propter aliena igitur peccata factus ille peccatum est, &
nos propter alienam justitiam justitia Dei facti sumus sicut
eum ille non suis, sed nostris peccatis peccatum a Deo, ita

nos non nostra ipsorum, sed ipsius justitia justitia Dei facit sumus a Deo.—

Facta namque mutatione peccata nostra sua, & justitiam suam nostram fecit, &c.

Sed fecit nos justitiam, id est, imputavit nobis justitiam, idque non nostram, quia nulla est, sed suam, gratuitam vide-licet & clementer a se imputatam, quam habeamus non in nobis, sed in ipso filio.—

*Lequitur de justitia quam nobis in Christo imputat si-
cuti peccata nostra illi imputavit.— In hac commutatione
omnis nostra salus est sita, ubi & Augustini illud; Ipsi er-
go peccatum, &c. in 2 Cor. 5. nlt.*

*Deinde sub Lege esse debitorem est esse facienda Legi, ad
obediendum illius preceptis, ac subeundum transgressionis
panashic queritur an ito quoq. sensu factus fuerit sub Lege
Christus Dei Filius? Etenim si justo non est Lex posita sed
injustis, quisnam reperietur ex omnibus hominibus, ad quem
minus pertineat subjectio ita qua Legi sit subditus, quam
Christus Filius Dei omnium innocentissimus ac justissi-
mus? Accedit & hoc, quod qui Dominus est Legis liber est
ab eis obseruantia: talis autem est Christus, &c.*

*Verum ut paucis sententiis mean expediam, non am-
pediant hie diligentes, quo minus etiam hoc posteriori
sensu, Christum sub Lege factum esse intelligamus. Licet
enam haud quaquam propter se subjici debuerit Legi, sub-
jectus tamen fuit propter alios quos redimere debebat. Qui
alionimi in se debita recipit, non minus debitor est quam si
propter sua ipsius esset debita creditori obstrictus.*

*Christus autem proprieatis missus fuit in hunc mundum
ut debita nostra in se recipere, proque illis satisfacere, sic
venit in sua factusque est sub Lege, haud propter se, sed pro-
pter eos qui sub Lege servient es condamnationi erant pro-
pter illius transgressiones obnoxii sic subjicit, ut eos qui, &c.
*Myst. in Gal. 4.**

And now for your other two Treatises of the same matter, God willing I shall examine all in your owne order.

An Examination of all the remaining parts of Master John Goodwins Treasise of Justification.

CHAP. III.

Containing other proofes from Scripture.

G.



R. O M such passages of Scripture where the works of the Law are absolutely excluded from Justification, Rom. 3.28. Gal. 2.16. and Rom. 3.20. &c. If man be justified by the righteousness of Christ imputed, he shall be justified by the works of the Law.

Answe. 1. When as we hold Christs Righteousness imputed, its not of the active obedience alone (which is pretended) but passive also; both; by both these imputed, we are made just before God, or justified. Let notice be taken of this once for all.

2. Workes of the Law cannot be absolutely excluded. When as there is an absolute necessity of their concurrence and influence contributing to the sacrifice of Christ and his Priestly offering them both to that height of acceptation for others: ex-

cluding those workes. You exclude the passive obedience also, which is not (without the other) sufficient, *ex concessis*, which it seemeth you intend not in objecting onely against that which is active.

3. If workes of the Law be *absolutely necessary* (as is granted) *to the sacrifice and Priesthood*, whither those, namely the perfect integrity and purity of his nature and obedience, confessedly concurring and inflowing to Justification, are not so to him as Mediator?

4. The acts of Christ's humiliation, all of those servile acts performed by him are confessedly concurring to Justification; mediatory. I shall willingly grant the merit of obedience in this respect considered, to be imputed to us as that which in part doth constitute the nature of Justification; all these in somuch as they are humiliation, so farre they also put on the nature of satisfaction, and in that consideration are imputed unto us. And elsewhere, *The satisfaction of Christ comprehended in those acts and sufferings is the matter of the righteousness, for which we are justified.*

These (it is true) are distinguished from those acts conformed to the Law, flowing from internall holinesse: by that reverend Authour. If truly, then those acts of humiliation did not flow from internall holines, &c. they did not proceed from Christ's love to God and man, from humility, from righteousness and piety in his soule. And if they did, the whole was performed to the mediatory Law, and for us, not himselfe, that he should live who was comprehensor from the first moment, lived certainly.

Master Bradshaw, though hee acknowledge Christ bound as man to the Law (notwithstanding personall union) yet hee maketh it a *part of Christ's humiliation*, p. 62. And *some part*, a part of his mediation, *ibid.* (truly what was a part of his humiliation, was a part of his Mediation) Every part thereof being of that nature that without the same no other satisfaction could have beene available or effectuall, and all proceeding from such an estate and condition, as be needed not to have undergone, nor had not if

Obedientia
meritum hoc
respectu confi-
derante nobis
imputarilibens
concederem, ut
quæ Justifica-
tione ratione
ex parte
constituit. Hæc
autem omnia
quarens hu-
miliationis ra-
tionem obti-
nent, caro-
nus et satisfactio-
nis naturam
induunt,
aque ea ratio-
ne nobis ad
Justificationem
imputantur. M.
Gat. adver. par.

1. p. 1. n. 1. 2.
Satisfactio
autem Christi
affibus per-
missionibusq;
illis compre-
hensa, est ju-
stificare, propter
quam nos ju-
stificamus, ma-
teria, ad Gom.
P. 5.

be had not taken upon him to satisfy for sinners. Some part of the satisfaction which he made, must needs consist therein, and therefore it must in some degree or other be imputed unto them, to their justification, id. p. 63. It must needs be also in some measure or other a part of the righteousness in and by the imputation whereof a sinner is justified, p. 64. Therefore the very assuming of our nature, and all the obedience he yielded therupon, and by reason thereof, &c. seeme to be some part of the allual execution of his Priestly Office, by meanes whereof, in part he pacified God, and consequently in part satisfied for sin, p. 65.

He was borne of a woman, not for his owne sake but for others, whose Saviour and Redeemer he is, so being borne he was made under the Law also, not for his owne cause, but for ours. That therefore he was borne of a woman, that for our sakes he might be under the Law, Also as he became a servant for our sake; so in that very regard he became under the Law of a servant, p. 66.

So much of his conformity to the Law, as concerneth his humiliatiōn, must either be unnecessary, or part of his Satisfaction, ib. p. 66. &c.

By all which it is apparent that workes of the Law are not absolutely excluded from Justification.

5. The very passive obedience of Christ, will not absolutely exclude the Law from Justification. Christ in his life had a passive action, in his death an active passion, whilēt he wrought salvation in the middest of the earth. In his passion there was the highest love of God, and most ardens to mankind, patience, obedience, humility, trust, invocation, hope. And the damned by suffering satisfie the Law, if Christ did so by suffering.

(d) The Law was satisfied by the sufferings of Christ. Christ performed those things for us, by which satisfaction is made to the Law for our sinnes. And 'tis most certaine that the Law of workes is established in justification by satisfaction intervening.

genus humanum dilectio, patientia, obedientia, humilitas, fiducia, invocatio, spes. Et damnati patiendo satisfaciunt legi. Christus patiendo, Gerrard de Justif. fol. 6. (d) Christus ea pro nobis præstit quibus legi illi pro culpis a nobis admilis satisfactum est Imo operum etiam legem in Justificatione peccatoris interveniente satisfactione, stabili, certissimum est.

(c) Christus in vita passivam habuit actionem, in morte passionem actionem, dum salutem operatur in medio terræ
Bern. Serm. 4.
beb. p. ante,
Col 124.
In passione summus amor
Dei & ardentissima erga.

Si obedientia
five iustitiae illi
quam nos legi,
vel Deo poti-
us vi legis de-
bebamus, quod
equipollat,
premium ali-
quod sit a
Christo pro
nobis depen-
sum, & a Deo
ipso eo nomi-
ne acceperum,
legi certe divi-
nus nihil quic-
quam deroga-
tur. — S. abilitur
dum impletur
in Gas advers.
par. 1. Sect. 10.
n. 8, 9. p. 42.
Etiam pena
est impletio
legis, *Parens de*
scit. & pass. p.
83.

Obligansur ad
panam vel ad
obedientiam,
&c.

If there be an equivalent price of obedience and righteouſneſſe paid by Christ, and accepted in that name by God, which we did owe to that Law, or rather to God by reason of that Law, then nothing certainly is derogated from the Divine Law. — It is established whilst it is fulfilled.

Punishment is the fulfilling of the Law. We are bound either to punishment or obedience: There is justice and righteousness in repairing injuries and wrongs. Thus much will arise from passages in your 1 Concl. tr. 2. p. 3. so that there is not an absolute exclusion of the Law when as sufferings are ascertained.

6. Againe, It seemeth much to me that you should hold an absolute exclusion of the works of the Law when as you establish Faith in a proper sense, and as a worke of obedience, as righteousness, if it be required in the Law (which considered against your deniall, the learned hold) the Law is not to be absolutely excluded. And though it be not in the Law originally; yet you know, It may be superadded, and in the Law as now it standes with additions and improvements: Which is your owne distinction, Treat. 2. p. 47. and 48. I may apply it to my purpose.

7. Once more, if there be no medium betwene a perfect freedom from sin, and perfect and compleat righteousness. And that in freedom from sin, the man is ipso facto made perfectly righteous, Righteousness being perfect conformity to Gods Law. Supposing that freedom to appertaine to Justification, to be the forme thereof as you. I wonder how this conformity to the Law can be absolutely excluded from Justification. If there be a truth in your 2. Conclusion, your absolute exclusion will not stand.

8. Then if Remission of sin (the forme of Justification as you) includes the imputation or acknowledgement of the observation of the whole Law, as the imputation of the Law fulfilled includes not imputation of sin, that such an one is looked upon as one that hath fulfilled the Law. If in the act of remission of sins, there be included the imputation of a perfect righteousness, which is all one with a perfect fulfilling of the Law.

Law, as you Conclus. 4.p. 5. 2 Treat. Whether this absolute exclusion of the workes of the Law from justification be consistente with it, both true?

9. I will but name it. Others (you know) are against you and teach a necessity of obedience to the Law to justification, as our debt, and that eternall way of God to live.

And that these places intend not obedience to the Law simply, but performed by our owne persons, though this is not personall performance, and that such obedience is impossible, it followeth not of the Law, performed for us by our Mediator. So our Church, &c. See before, and some of the reasons now named are confessedly, inforce; as, where the death of Christ, is satisfaction to the Law.

But you cannot indure this answer; and therefore against it, say, 1. *Not to be justified by the workes of the Law, is as much as not to be justified by any workes of the Law whatsoever.*

I answer, True, performed by a mans selfe, not by another, and whether what hath beeene premised, be not sufficient against an absolute exclusion of the Law, which is in your argument, and that *ex concessis*, I leave to your second thoughts.

2. Neither is there *blame in the Apostle, or unfaithfullnesse*: Seing, where he layeth downe that we are made righteous by the obedience of Christ, he layeth downe the workes of obedience of Christ to the Law. Not to use repetitions else premised, that necessary influence and concurrence of it with the passive obedience.

3. Neither is it therefore *a snare upon men*, seeing there is intimation sufficient, and inclinaunce of his obedience to the Law, so manifest as hath beeene shewed.

4. Neither had Saint Paul need your teaching him to preach, he Preached Christ our Mediatour and Surety, humbled to death for us, *Obedient to death for us*. And justification by Faith in him. All which notwithstanding, they were ignorant of that which is called Gods righteousness, and hence they establisched their own Righteousnesse,

and submitted not themselves to the righteousnesse of God, which is Christ, the end of the Law for righteousnesse to believers. When as there is such an evident, absolute, necessary concurrence and inclusions and interpretations as have beeene spoken of, you may see the vanity of this illusion.

Here you urge objected against your selfe, hat *Paul* gave sufficient intimation of the righteousnesse of Christ, when as he first excludeth what is done by our selves, and mentioneth Chrits doing the works of the Law. The first from *Tit. 3.5.* and the second from *Gal. 4.4.*

To which you answer, and first to that of *Titus*.

That the active obedience of Christ shoulde be wholly excluded, and be made a stand-by, so as to have nothing at all to doe in the great busynesse of Justification, this discourse no way affirmeth. It hath beeene expressly acknowledged from the beginning to have a gracious and blessed influence thereto, as it issmeth and falleth into bis passive obedience. Which together may be called a Righteousnesse for which, but at no hand a Righteousnesse with which we are justified, &c.

Very well, this is what I observe, the destruction of your argument from an absolute exclusion (this to be the matter or forme, is not an absolute exclusion, which yet is your conclusion in this argument where you call it an essentiall requisite.) In the meane while, You know there are many, all that I know, but some two or three of you, that make it the matter of our Justification, and forme also as it's applied, and establish the merit, what ever you say, and but say, to the contrary.

Therefore *ex concessis* the rejection (in those words) of *works which we have done* ; *but in respect to the matter*

First, may suppose, the works of righteousnesse of Christ, as part of the satisfaction necessarily inflowing : which is answer to what you say.

Secondly, *This must be supposed and established, at Jam. p. 16.* in this busynesse though not named.

When as it is said not by works of Righteousnes which we have done, it's all-one as to say our owne selves have done

¹
G. p.62.

Answer.

²

done, for we and our selves are all one.

May it nay must, seeing they are a cause and absolutely necessary, as your selfe teach. As Christs death is supposed, so this inflowing necessarily, being an essentiall requisite.

Neither will it be put out of question, because the Apostle names Gods mercy. For as Gods mercy and Christs death stand together and have place in Justification, so Christs workes concurring with Christs death, the mercy of God and Christs merits agree sweetly.

Neither by that that mercy is explained in the new birth, and washing with the Holy Ghost. For mercy in the effect regeneration will consist also with Justification: washing is a generall Justification and sanctification species or particulars thereof, at the same time performed by the same Spirit, as 1 Cor. 6. 11. they are inseparable.

Yea saving implyeth as freedom from guilt and punishment, so righteousness by which, though it be not here expressed. Finally, passing that non-sense, given as a reason, why this place is impertinent, in these words: Because it is evident that the Apostle here rejects the workes of Righteousnesse, which he names from being any causes antecedently moving God to save us, and not from being the forme of Justification. For it maketh the Apostle not to exclude workes of Righteousnesse from being the forme of Justification, and so to be a Patron of Popery, whose tenet that is. To what followeth.

That, If it be granted that the workes of Christ must of necessity be here implied: All that will follow it, that not our workes but Christs moved God to save us, by the washing of the new birth.

To which I answer, not Christs workes, but Gods mercy in Christ, and by his active and passive obedience. Mercy moved God to choose us in Christ, to appoint us to salvation by the meane of our Lord Jesus Christ, and accordingly to execute the same in whole salvation, in Justification; though it moveth as being the meritorious cause, it is also the matter, as after, and forme as applied in washing us by the Holy Ghost, the Spirit applying or sprinkling us.

us with the blood of that holy Lambe, waubeth, sanctifieth, and justifieth.

The same blood of that holy Lanibe, or active and passive obedience of Christ that justifieth, is not onely a meritorious cause, and so fit matter (which could not be, if it had not worth) but also that which applied supplyeth the place of a forme justifying, which were it never so worthy, without application it could never doe. When you lay downe Reasons you shall heare more.

P. 66.

To that place, Gal.4.4. that you may illude it, you say, First, *Christ's being made under the Law, doth not signify Christ's subjection to the Morall Law, but rather the Ceremoniall Law; that was it we were under, from that be redeemed we, and it is not reasonable be shold be made under any other Law.*

I answer, We were under the Morall Law, its curse and condemnation, under its strict and personall performance, as well as it, considered as a rule of life. And though it continueth as a rule of life, we are by Christ redeemed from the curse and condemnation thereof, and strict personall performance of it. And this was the effect and end of Christ's making under the Law. And there is more reason that this should be infolded, for as much as this was the greatest bondage of the twaine.

G.

Secondly, Yousay, *Taking it for the Morall Law, it was not to the preceptive part, but the curse. Whick standing, the case is plaine, there is no place for the workes of Christ. No Answer, affirming either the death of Christ, or the imputation of his death, shoud be the formall or materiall cause of Justification.*

1. It was to the preceptive part as well as the curse. Both are our debt, our Surety was accursed for us, and fulfilled all Righteousnesse for us; paid our whole debt.

2. When as you say his death was the price, by which he deserved our Justification. You will have us, and wee you, to remember, it was not so without influence of the active obedience of Christ. You will not have the active obedience

dience separated from the passive, nor again the passive from the active, in respect of this common and joint effect of sanguineness of sinnes, or justification arising from a concurrence of them both, p. 132 &c.

And Sir, it is the common tenet of Protestants, that the obedience of Christ is the matter of justification, and imputation, the forme, that is such by analogy, and instead thereof. And Saint Paul saith, that *By the obedience of one, many shall be made righteous, constituted.* Nothing but righteousness can make righteous, that applied maketh us so, or justifieth us, and you must acknowledge that your owne phrase, often used.

CHAP. IV.

A Demonstration from Scripture of the non-imputation of Christ's Righteousness for Justification.

FROM ROM 3. 21. But now the righteousness of God is made manifest without the righteousness of the Law, having witness of the Law and the Prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by the faith of Jesus Christ, unio all, and upon all that doe believe.

If the righteousness of faith consist in the imputation of Christ's righteousness, then is it not, nor can it be made manifest without the Law, the works of the Law; but the righteousness of faith is sufficiently manifested without the Law, therefore it doth not consist in the imputation of Christ's righteousness, p. 70.

The righteousness of faith is that which faith receiveth, which God giveth or imputeth, the righteousness of Christ, and it is revealed without the Law; (faith Parens)

(a) *Not in the Law, therefore it is not Legal.* By that is the knowledge of sinne, not of the righteousness by which we are are justified. (b.) *The Law, professedly delivereth not that, but urgeth righteousness of works;* The man that

(a) Non in Le.
g., non est
ergo legalis.

(b) Lex ex pro-
fesso tam non
tradit, sed urget
justitiam ope-
rum, qui fecerit
ea vivet in eis
Parens in loca.

(c) Dixit et su-
pr. 1. 17 re-
tegitur per E-
vangelium :
quod hic repe-
tendum. Sic
inuit pater
Legem aliud
doctrine genus
in Ecclesia a
Lege distinctum,
argumento &
usu. Lex in
praeceps sita
est, arguit pec-
cata, & damna-
tionem adserit :
Evangelium in
promissione
gratiae constitutum,
offerens iusti-
tiam & salutem
gratuitam cre-
dentiibus in
Christum—in-
nuit etiam du-
plicem esse iustitiam, unam Legisculo Legalem, seu operum, ineffacientem & impossibilem
hominum virtutem : alteram Evangelicam & Angelicam, seu fidei efficacem & salutarem. Pa-
reus in locum. (d). Aduersus haec fidem, iustitiam, non efficit, quia habituatur iu-
stos efficiat—nec materialiter, quasi ipsa sit illud quia iusti consumunt : sed objective, qua-
tenus in Christum qui est iustitia nostra diriguntur, & organice, quatenus dominum iustitiam
Christi merito credentibus gratis imputare apprehendit, Par. in v. 22. (e) Semel ob-
serveur, Phrasimus quipollentium (omnes & omnia) iustitia non nostra, aliena; or non
propria, or propria. See p. 194. 195. &c &c. And that is yesternay per abundantem
Chariti, & iustitia impunita a Dco, p. 190.

2. So that I answer, that righteousness is not in the
text of my booke.

2. Those that are justified by Christ, &c. are so by a
righteousness not revealed in the Law. But the righteous-
ness of faith is the righteousness of Christ imputed, which
is expressly manifested by the Gospel without the Law.

To the Argument I deny the consequence of the major:
that which the Law revealeth is our own, & that doth them
full live in them, as before,

It is not another, nor Christ's, nor imputed righteousness, nor Gospel righteousness, the righteousness of God, as the Apostle calleth it, or the righteousness of faith.

When as you lay the body and substance of the righteousness in [sic] is nothing else but a pure Law or the works of it. Your adversaries lay it confuseth in both active and passive righteousness, and being that it is a righteousness not performed by us, but another, our Surety: (that of the Law being *Qui faceris* & *want*) you may perceive that it is not legal, and that it is manifested without the Law.

To this you seeme to object. 1. That this Sanctuary hath beeene already polluted, and the hornes of the Altar broken downe. I answer, Let the Reader and your selfe againe and see.

2. The righteousness of faith cannot be fully taught without any consideration of the Law, *ex-sacra*, *teaching* Christ's righteousness active hark *a messenger conseruance and influence to make his passion fit statement*.

3. Though the works performed by Christ be the works of the Law, and we justified by them (together with the passive) which also is obedience to the Law, yet they are not legal righteousness: *Qui faceris*, is the voice of the Law; were they our proper personall workes, it were to purpose; being the righteousness of another, the Law revealeth it not, neither are they properly legal.

4. To this righteousness active and passive, the Law, and Prophets give testimony as unto the Surety himselfe, so to his righteousness, and this is that which we teach to be applied by faith, which you confess hath testimony. The Law, &c. open the seed of the woman, the blessed Seed, the Lord our righteousness, making an end of lawe, bringing in everlasting righteousness. And when as that is so *absolutely necessary* as is shewed to constitute our Priest and his Sacrifice, and the efficacie of both them and me. It is a wonder to me that the same mouth should argue to an utter conclusion of it.

Finally this is to all and upon all by faith we confess

opposition betweene faith and the workes of the Law, personall performances, neither is there perfect agreement betweene the workes of Christ and the Law, there is as much difference in justification as betweene our owne and another's, a sureties, what is given and imputed by God, received by faith, and what a man doth in his own person : Hearken to Calvin on the place.

Pancis verbis ostendit qualis sit haec iustificatio, nempe quod in Christo refidetur per idem ut: o apprehenditur.

Primum iustificationis nostre causam non ad hominum iudicium referri, sed ad Dei tribunal. Ubi nulla iustitia censetur nisi perfecta absolutaque Legis obedientia. Quod si nemo hominum reperiatur qui, ad eam exceptam sanctitatem, concenderit sequitur omnes iustitiam in se ipsius destinatos. Tum occurrit Christus oponeret, qui ut solus iustus est, ita suam iustitiam in nos transferendo iustos nos reddit. Nunc vides ut iustitia fidei iustitia Christi sit.

15

Then Christ must be made us just, transferring his righteousness on us. Now you see that the righteousness of faith is the righteousness of Christ. Where he calleth Christ the matter, and the word, and faith the instrument, and addeth :

Quare fides iustificare dicitur quia instrumentum est recipiendi Christi, in quo nobis communicatur iustitia.

Wherefore faith is said to justify, because it is the instrument of receiving Christ, in whom righteousness is communicated unto us.

Postquam factissimus Christi participes, non ipse solum iusti sumus, sed opera nostra iusta reputantur coram Deo.

And then, After we be made partakers of Christ, not only we are just, but also our workes are reputed just before God.

Where you have our compleat Doctrine.— And consider with what vaine confidence you call him to your part.

CHAP. V.

From Rom. 5. 16, 17. Compared; where

THe gift of righteousness, at v. 17. which is by Christ in the Gospel, is said, v. 16. to be a free gift of many offences to justification. Whence thus, that righteousness which is the gift of many offences, that is, the forgivensse of many offences or sinnes to justification; cannot be a perfect legall righteousness imputed to us, or made ours by imputation. But the righteousness which is by Christ in the Gospel by which we are justified, is the gift of many offences unto justification; therefore it cannot be a perfect legall righteousness, made ours by imputation.

I deny the gift of righteousness, and the free gift or forgivensse of many offences are the same, they differ as cause & effect, as sin and condemnation are cause and effect, so righteousness and remission of sinnes. Righteousness imputed hath its immediate effect, justification. It is a *righteoum ms-* king, of which remission of sinnes, is (to speake properly) a concomitant or consequent effect. *Those that receive a-* bundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, are there-*by justified, and so receive forgivensse of sinnes. So vers. 18.* By the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all to justification of life. Where there is the effect or end, and the cause by which Sions converts shall be redeemed with righteousness, Isa. 1. 27.

Life regneth out of abundance of grace, that is, by grace abounding, and by the gift of righteousness, which is abundantly given us of God by impu- tation, *but is received of us by faith.*

If we desire to be freed from that Kingdome, and translated unto this, it is necessary we receive the gift of righteousness in Christ by faith. That received, justifieth, on which remission or free-
dom followeth.

Via perpetuo comitatur justitiam, ut
mors peccatum sicut ubi peccatum ibi mors
est ex ordine justitie, & veritate com-
missionis divinæ, sic ubi justitia—
five gratis imputata ut in fidibus electis ubi
vita Regnari partim ex eodem justitie divi-
ne ordine, partim & maxime ex promissione
gratiz, Qui credit in filium habet vitam eterna-

Life ever accompanieth righteousness,
as death doth sin: as where sin is,
there is death out of Gods justice, and
the truth of divine threatening: so where
righteousness— or freely imputed as
in the evill believing, there life re-
tained partly out of the same order of
Divine justice, and specially by the
promise of grace, He that believeth in the Son hath eternall life.

1. We lay not that the righteousness by which we are
justified, is a perfect legall righteousness, that is, right-
eousness performed by our owne persons.

2. Yet we affirme that that righteousness by which im-
puted we are justified, includeth our Sureties full satisfac-
tion to Gods Law, and doth not absolutely exclude the
the same as you teach.

Jure vocat di-
ximus, iudicium
satisfactionem,
quoniam sicut
Legis impletio
per personam p.
370. in v. 18.

Take that part, Christs death for us, this the Apostle
rightly calleth a just satisfaction (with Paratus) because it meet
the fulfilling of the Law by punishment. Here we shall have
you bound, so that the fulfilling of the Law simply
cannot be excluded: and then you know the confessed
concurrence and influence of Christs active obedience and
necessity thereof is asserted by your selfe; and that the
Devil and damned suffering doe not satisfie the Law to life,
as Gerhardus.

We deny not, but affirme the righteousness of Christ
in the Gospel, by which we are justified, extendeth unto a
humane justification and forgivenesse of sinnes: but may
well deny that justification is by the forgivenesse of sinnes.
It is by righteousness imputed, on which remission fol-
loweth, and if it shold be by it, and theras the forme (as
you) it shold be in order of nature before justification.

It is by imputation of both active and passive obediences,
both which have a precedency in order, both to justification,
as that by which, and so to pardon of sinne by the
same reason.

When you say, if a man sinnes because his given him
he hath no need of imputation of any former righteousness, per-

72. for his justification; I subscribe: yet that they may be forgiven there is need of the imputation of Christ's perfect obedience, active and passive, that which justifieth, on which there is no imputation of sinnes.

That remission of sinnes is whole justification or justification properly; I deny: it is an effect of righteousness imputed by your texts, ver. 16. 18. following just making or justification, which we assert against you, must be by righteousness; and that applied to them, for they are said to be *holy, and unreprovable, and unblamable, wholly faire, white as Snow, whiter then the Snow, perfected for ever,* for which there must be somewhat applied effecting the same. We profess no such righteousness elsewhere, but onely the active and passive righteousness of our Surety given us by God, and applied by faith.

When as you tell us that the righteousness we have by Christ, wherewith we are said to be justified before God by believing, is onely a negative righteousness, not a positive, it is nothing but non-imputation of sinne, which you call a righteousness by interpretation, as having the priviledges, but not the nature of a perfect legall righteousness.

1. We say not that the positive righteousness, by which, is legall, that is, of our owne performance, but anothers, and so must be called Evangelicall.

2. We put a righteousness, Christ's intire obedience from conception even to death, as Rom. 5. 19.

3. We deny it to consist in nothing but a non-imputation of sinne, that is no-righteousness, it is righteousness in your interpretation, not the Lord's.

The priviledges of one legally just your selfe give to faith elsewhere, as here to forgiveness, and faith in that respect may be our whole justification, if that be enough to have the priviledges, so I may say of repentance.

Let us see how you make this good.

1. You shew it out of Rom. 4. 6. compared with the 7. and 8. where it is called a righteousness without works, which must needs be negative; the imputation of righteousness is interpreted nothing else but a non-imputing of sinne, and so is consist in par-
tiall of sinne.

1. I answer, these places your selfe urge for imputation of faith in a proper sense, and so confound faith and justification or imputation of righteousness.

2. Righteousnes positive is said to be imputed, v. 4. v. 11.

3. That it taken for the righteousness of Christ, which I have proved is righteousness without works, that is, not personally performed by us, though it be by another, that is, Christ.

4. That non-imputation of sinne is not the same with imputation of righteousness, but the latter is the cause, the former the effect, as is shewed by me.

And as for *Calvyn*, he excludeth not the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and calleth this the effect thereof, which also is shewed before.

You adde, 2 Cor. 5. 19. &c. 21. that which he calls v. 19. *In God the not imputation of sins unto us*, he calls vers. 21. *a being made the righteousness of God in him*.

I deny it, and there they differ as cause and effect, that in the 21. vers. For, &c. is the cause of that in the 19. vers. and *Calvyn* on the place saith,

Justitia hic non pro qualitate aut habitu, sed pro imputatione accipitur, eo quod accepta nobis fertur Christi justitia.

Righteousnes here is taken not for quality or habit, but for imputation, because Christ's righteousness is accounted to us. To that Question.

Quomodo justi sumus coram Deo? quia Christus fuit peccator, personam enim nostram quodammodo suscepit ut reus nostro nomine heret & tanquam peccator judicetur, non propriis sed alienis delictis; quem partus foret ipse & immunitus ab omni culpa, panamque libenter nobis non sibi debitas. Ita sc. nunc justi sumus in ipso, non quia operibus propriis satisfaciamus iudicio Dei, sed quoniam censemur Christi justitia, quam fide induamus ut nostra hab. Calv.

How are we just before God? for sooth as Christ was a sinner, for in a sort he tooke our person that he might be made guilty and judged of a sinner, not by his owne, but others sinnes, seeing he was pure and free from all fault, and was to undergoe punishment due, not to us, but himselfe. So now we are just in him, not because we may satisfie the judgement of God by ourne works, but because we are accounted in his righteousness, which by faith we put on that it may be made ours.

But *Acti* 13. 38, 39. openeth it clearely, where the Be it knowne unto you that through this man is preached unto you for-givenessse

givenesse of sinnes, and by him all that beeleeve are justified from all things from whicb you could not be justified by the Lawe of Moses. Justification bence is laid downe by the way of negative or privative righteousnesse, not a positive; so that the justification is not with righteousness, (properly so called) but a justification from sinne, &c. p. 77.

G.

A.

1. This place prooveth that through Christ is preached pardon and iustification, &c. It followeth not that there is no positive righteousness. Nay through this man infoldeth the same, that is through his intire satisfaction preached also.

2. Forgiuenesse and justification from, &c. implieth that party righteous, else shoulde God iustifie a wicked man which is abominable.

3. Recount your great axiome of things *immediate contraria*. And see whether from the position of pardon you doe not inferre and put perfect righteousness, and suppose it to the passive obedience, its energie or being propitious.

4. Finally, the dispulsion of darknesse, &c. any contrary is by the introduction of its contrary, light, &c.

It is righteousness imputed that hath attending pardon.

You say this is the proper signification and most usuall, not to signifie giving or bestowing a compleate positive righteousness, but discharging, cusing, Prov. 17. 15.

G.

This is shewed otherwise by that text: when God iustifieth a wicked man, he maketh him just first, thence the rights and priviledges of just men, these priviledges of a just man goe together, else shall the priviledges of a just man be common to him with the wicked, abomination.

And one would beleeve just making should be proper and most usuall who shall obserue it your owne ordinary expreſſion, See p. 35. p. 38. out of Haymo. Treat. 2. p. 112. 116. 117. 118. 144. twice 145. 150. 163. 136. it is nothing else, p. 218. and I finde remission of sinnes confessed the privilege of a man just. p. 5. 1. Treat.

CD

That text Rom. 8. 33, 34. Who shall lay, &c. it is God that iustifieth, sheweth the effect by the cause, because God iustifieth

C

there

there is no condemnation, so Rom. 5.9. justification is by the death of Gods Sonne, and this we confesse done by faith, as Gal. 3. 11. as an instrument, not by our doing this; yet must you not exclude the obedience of Christ unill death, that which qualifieth: yea, its included in death that it be a pleasing sacrifice, the synecdoche will salute that, of which more after, it answereth that Jef. 53. 11. where he is said to bear our iniquities.

For *Calvyn* and the rest cited by you, they have the same answer, and that truly in the judgement of many witnesses; amongst whom there is *C. Smicer* one of your Authors, I and *Pareus*, who sheweth that the judgement of all, *Calvyn* and all the rest; and let the Reader judge who is injurious, of which you complaine.

CHAP. VI.

Argument 5. P. 84.

THIS is taken from the opening of Phil. 3.9. And be found in him not having mine owne righteousness which is of the Law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God through faith. Hence you observe.

1. He saith not that he may be found in his righteousness, much less in his righteousness imputed unto him, but simply in himselfe.

To be found in him not having his own righteousness, is to be found having union and communion with him and his righteousness. Christ's righteousness must be supplied in opposition to his owne, to be found in him, is to be found in the Lord his righteousness, in him there is redemption, remission of sinnes in his blood. You grant his passive righteousness, yet here you oppose him, Christ and righteousness; and as for your exception against imputation, herein you are a *Wottonist*, an *Arminian*, and *Socinian*, and will not understand that imputation, is but the application and donation of the righteousness of Christ by God

God apprehended by faith, which are necessarily supposed to mine having him and his righteousness.

Beza will teach you better, To Inveniri in Christo, tacitam habet relationem ad Dei iudicium. Is enim in amando contemplatur unum suum Christum in quo acquerat, Itaque quae competit in Christo esse (id est, Christus per fidem infitos) in iis nullam invenit condemnationem: Quia iustitia qualcum ipse requirit in nobis, id est, perfecta, accumulata exornatos eos invenit. Nimirum Christum iustitia per fidem nobis imputata.

be found in Christ hath a tacite relation to Gods judgement; for he in loving doth contemplate his owne Christ in whom he may be well pleased. Therefore those whom he findeth to be in Christ, that is, in-set into Christ by faith) in these he findeth no condemnation, because he findeth them arraigned in righteousness, such as he requireth in us, that is, perfect and besped downe, even Christs righteousness imputed to us by faith.

In him, that is, Christ my Lord, who is righteousness, &c. It is of faith because by faith we apprehend it, because it is imputative, and is applied to us by Christs merit, at Aretius.

So generally he opposeth mans merit to the grace of Christ: for when or the Law bringeth works, faith man nacked to God, that he may be clothed with Christs righteousness, Calvine.

Christ himselfe must be put upon us, that we may be found in him, &c. with his clothing our soules must be clothed, that they may be beautified and gloriously adorned— Phil. 3. 9. where he excludeth all kinde of works, he must needs understand the righteousness of Christ.

I have read that our faith hath beene excluded by this text, never that the righteousness of Christ should be so, by a Protestant, it is Christs righteousness alone which will indure the pure sight of God here and hereafter.

2. You observe from those words, *But that which is of God by faith, here is not the least jot or tittle of any mention, &c. of any righteousness he shoulde have by imputation of the righteousness of Christ. No, nor any righteousness by or through the righteousness of Christ, but onely such a righteousness as is divinitus Xerū, through faith of Christ, or believing in him, and*

Whitaker against Camp.
which Doreas
Englisched, p.

231.

this is that righteousness say you, and that righteousness of God.
 2. A righteousness which God himself hath found out, and
 which he will ordene and countenance and account for righteousness,
 and no other but this.— The mentioning of this righteousness
 the second time, as being or standing in faith, is doubtless
 emphaticall.— It is to shew that this righteousness will carry it,
 notwithstanding the unlikeness and seeming imperfections of it,
 and that the thing is fully concluded and established with God.
 — If Paul had had any minde or inclination at all to have placed
 the righteousness by which we are justified in the righteousness
 of Christ imputed, here was a tempting occasion.— But here is
 loud speaking againe and againe of the righteousness of faith,
 but alhum silentium of any righteousness from the imputation
 of the righteousness of Christ, p. 87. & 88.

Nimirum Christi
justitia ap-
plicata,

That which Paul would be found having, is not his own,
 but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness
 which is of God by faith.

This we interpret the righteousness of Christ given by God
 applied by faith. So Beza, you faith in Christ it selfe.

But first it cannot be faith it selfe, seeing the text is, that
 righteousness which is through faith, & of God by faith, where
 faith is but an instrument, by which I have that righteousness,
 it is not said, believing, but by believing: that faith
 is the righteousness he would be found in, but that of God
 by faith. Beza that Prince of the Arminian band urgeth
 this text against Sibrandus, Epist. p. 57. and hath this an-
 swer.

Quod ad dictū
 ad Phil. 3. c at-
 tinet: Serveti,
 Socini, tuamq;
 sententiam ex
 professio de-
 struir, diserte
 enim inter fi-
 dem & inter ju-
 dicijam distin-
 guit. Versu enim 9. dicit, interprete Beza. Sed ut habeam eam justitiam, quia per
 fidem est Christi, equidem si haec justitia est Christi per fidem ut Beza interpretatur: vel si
 est per fidem Christi, ut vetus interpres haberet, non justitia haec non est ipsa fides.— Deinde Apostolus Serveti, Socini tuamque sententiam profutus rejicit, diserte enim scribit,
 righteousness

righteousness is not faith it selfe.—Then the Apostle doth wholly reject the opinion of Servetus, Socinus, and you: for he plainly writeth, vers. 9. that I may be found in him not having mine owne righteousness. But it is not my righteousness by which I am justified; and this rightly, for the body Christ plainly teacheth, Rom. 5. 19. us to be constituted just, that is, that we are justified with the righteousness of Christ. But faith which I have, (if you will speake according to the Scriptures) is thy faith, Hab. 2. 4. The just shall live by his faith; and Jam. 2. 18. Shew me thy faith by thy works, and I will shew my faith. If therefore my faith be my righteousness, and I am justified by this my faith, then I am justified by mine owne righteousness, and I ought to be found in him having mine owne righteousness: so that either the Apostle doth unwisely, when he writheth, that I may be found in him having mine owne righteousness; or you do unwisely whilst you will be justified by your owne righteousness, or which is the same, whilst you will be found having your owne righteousness. The Apostle teacheth the righteousness which he desirereth to have, v. 9. to be of Christ, but having that righteousness which is by faith of Christ; but my faith in what ever manner it be taken, is not Christ's righteousness, neither is it that righteousness which is by the faith of Christ, but the obedience which Christ performed to his Father, for me, is Christ's righteousness, and with this I am justified, Rom. 5. 19. Nothing therefore could be done more unwisely by thee, then to alleadge that place for the establishment of thine error.

Besides, it is much worse in you then him, Because you take faith in Christ, not in relation to its object,

Fides ita meritum Christi respicit, atque hoc modo vero est quod dicunt fides justificat non per se sed correlative, quantum nimis apprehendit Christianum ejusque justitiam. Ipse viderit.

Christ's righteousness, taking in that, but in a proper sense, and direct opposition to Christ's righteousness. Whereas in one place of *Berius* I finde, *That faith respecteth the merit of Christ, and thus it is true which is said, faith justifieth not by it selfe, but correlative, as it apprehendeth Christ and his righteousness.* How he agreeth with himselfe, let him looke to that, as your Mr. *Wotton* once said.

When faith is that, and as a worke, (as elsewhere from *John* 6.) How am I not justified by a worke, and that of the Law too, if faith be required there, as some conceive, and I speake to elsewhere? See *Sybr.* p. 56. & 57.

And when as it is not righteousness, or but inherent; Am I not justified by inherent righteousness? an opinion worse then that of Papists, who joyn hope and charity, &c. with faith, as Mr. *Forbs*.

And when as it is an imperfect grace, how can God, whose judgement is according to truth, account this perfect righteousness? it hath need of somewhat else to cover and to justify it. You acknowledge it imperfect, the Papist pressing it plead its perfection in this life.

And what will become of the Passive obedience of Christ, if this be that righteousness in opposition to the righteousness of Christ? What need is there of him or his righteousness? Lesse it be to merit that faith be accepted, as *Oferodus*.

What need of remission of sinnes? your interpretative righteousness by which I have the privileges of a righteous man? I have it by faith in your doctrine and then, away with that as well as the righteousness of Christ. And here let all men take notice of your minde, when as you call it faith in Christ, and that it is an instrument to bring us to fellowship with Christ and his benefits, when yet, here, and in the whole controversie you deny a relative or figurative sense taking in Christ and his righteousness, and put it in opposition. If you will be found in, that doe my prayer is with that Doctor, that I may be found not having faith, mine owne righteousness, if righteousness, and such as it is or ever shall be; but that which

which God giveth or imputeth, Christ, by faith. I believe, helpe mine unbelief. See after, the last Scripture, out of Zan-
dy, see Doctor Ayrie in locum. Olevian.

CHAP. VII.

Sixtly, that that God imputes for righteousness in justification, is not the righteousness of Christ himself, but faith it selfe, by Rom. 3. 28. Rom. 5. 1. and all confess that men are justified by faith, or act or habit, and why doe they condemn me?

I answer, faith with us is an instrument laying hold of the object Christ and his righteousness as an hand doth riches, by which righteousness applied, I am righteous, as rich by the object received riches.

You say you divide not faith and the object, you imply the object with it, as the usuall manner of the Scripture is, and 2. that it justifieth instrumentally, p. 90. 3. and grant as it taketh bold on Christ's righteousness, (though the Scripture never mentioneth it under this consideration) yet still it is an act of faith.

G.

1. You say it justifieth not as an act, ib. and yet take it in a proper sense, opposing it in justification to the righteousness of Christ, faith and not the righteousness of Christ.

2. When you give all be granted to faith, that it bath Christ the object, and laieth bold on Christ's righteousness: Yet you teach us that Christ's righteousness (in the variety used in Scripture of the objects of faith) is not to be found in the least mention, p. 38. Neither is the righteousness of Christ the object of faith as justifying, p. 47. onely is propounded to be believed as the creation of the world, or that Cain was Adams sonne, p. 43. neither is it imputed for righteousness in respect of the object, or because it laieth bold upon Christ, or Christ's righteousness,

P. 14.

Whereas the orthodox whom you oppose, not onely teach faith in Christ, and that an instrument laying hold of Christ and his righteousness applying it, but justifying as.

as applying that righteousnesse, by which applied we are made just.

Faith is as the pencill, it is an instrument, the matter, whiting; the pencill maketh not white but instrumentally, it is the whiting applied by the pencill.

The hand receiving riches is an instrument making rich. I, but instrumentally, riches received properly make rich, faith is but an instrument laying hold of the righteousnesse of Christ, by it as an instrument we are justified, but that which properly doth is the righteousnesse of Christ himself; and here we say not that whatsoever faith laith hold on justifieth, but *signanter*, we name the righteousnesse of Christ.

So, figuratively taking in the object, Christs righteousnesse, it justifieth, as an instrument to this effect, so it justifieth; so faith is imputed for righteousnesse: here is somewhat equivalent and exceeding the righteousnesse of the Law, which is false of faith not applying Christs righteousnesse, and then is it the condition of the Covenant when as it taketh in the object, as is elsewhere shewed.

CHAP. VIIIL

The last proof from Scripture.

THe Scriptures doe absolutely deny a transriblenesse, translation or transferring, or moving the righteousnesse of one person to another, from Gal. 3.12. and the Law is not of faith, but the man that doth them shall live in them, it denieth it to be done with faith, which was the likeliest band under Heaven—— by which he intendeth to make the righteousnesse of the Law or performed by Christ uncapable of this translation or imputation—— faith derives remission from Christ, but not the righteousnesse of the Law, the scope sheweth it is the very doer that shall live, &c.

1. Removing righteousnesse from one person to another, are not our words, we say not that Christs righteousnesse imputed is removed, or that it is taken from Christ,

we

we teach it to be subjective in him selfe.

We assert his righteousness transferrible, that is, that it may be, and is imputed or given to us.

He was our *Surety*, he satisfied for us, if there be an absolute impossibility of transferring what is done for another, you destroy suretiship, Chrits being our *Surety*.

3. His death is imputable, or sufferings of death, you must hold that imputation of them, or else confess your selfe a *Socinian*, Mr. *Gat*. exempteth himselfe thereby, dealing with *Lucius*.

If his sufferings, all of them, from his incarnation or conception to his death, his being man, doings and sufferings, forme of a servant, services in that forme, all his poverty, unto, till death, as well as death it selfe; in which there are many servile acts to the Law. Mr. *Gataker* excludeth not them or their imputation, nor *Pareus*; your selfe teach a concurrence and influence of works absolutely necessary to make atonement.

And if Christ did not obey for himselfe (which was vaine, seeing he lived from the firſt moment) it was for us; his being man holy and just, &c. was his humiliation, poverty, *he became poore, that we through his poverty might be made rich.*

His sufferings were fulfillings of the Law, *even punishment is the fulfilling of the Law.*

If sufferings are imputable, the fulfilling of the Law is in all these respects, and are imputed, or else we have no good by them. It is nothing that there is ſuch vertue in Jesus Christ if there be no application, and application receiving on our part necessarily putteth giving and imputation from the Lord.

Etiā pena
est impletio
Legis Par. de
Just. Aſl. &c.
p. 183.

Now to your argument, we deny the Law to be that by which we are justified, or that the righteousness by which is Legall. It is evident (say we) because that runneth, *The man that doth this shall live*; if we were ſo legally, we muſt be ſo in & by our ſelves personally, *doe this*, neither needed we a Mediator; we cannot doe this, this and faith are *afflata*, put this, faith is vaine in this matter, when

we disclaime personall *due this*, there must be grace, and that in Christ. He must be a Surety, conceived, borne, obedient, even to death, dead to make satisfaction; Gods giving him to us, our receiving of him, beleeving in him, by which we have union and communion with him, and his obedience, Passive, and what necessarily concurreth and in-floweth thereunto. In Christ we have pardon, and adoption, and eternall life; imputation of righteousnesse is necessary to pardon; by imputation of righteousnesse we are made just, and so justified from sinnes; by adoption we are heires of the righteousnesse of faith, that is, the righteousnesse which faith apprehendeth; *we inherit the promises*, that of righteousnesse by which we are white as Snow, whiter.

And this righteousnesse is necessary to life, *the Spirit is life because of righteousnesse*, imputed, Chamier, Rom. 8. 10. *they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousnesse, shall reigne in life even by one Jesus Christ*, Rom. 5. 16. *Grace reignes through righteousnesse to eternall life*, vers. ult.

This is Gods righteousnesse, what he giveth, and we by faith receive; there is a subordination betwene Gods grace, the promise, Christ, his obedience, pardon, life, faith, righteousnesse is not personall but of the Surety. And this is notably set forth as by forraine Divines, so by our owne, and the Doctrine of our Church, to which we have subscribed. I will send you thither, and proceed.

CHAP. IX.

Argument 1. That righteousnesse of Christ cannot be imputed. Thus,

THAT righteousnesse which will not fit and furnish all believers with all points or parts of that righteousnesse which the Law requires of them, cannot be imputed to them for justification.

But

But the obedience Christ performed to the Morall Law, will not fit and furnish all believers with all points of righteousness, which the Law requires of them: therefore it cannot be imputed to believers for their justification.

I will grant the major, and if Christ's righteousness imputed be not compleat, serving all, it is nothing worth; onely consider how your imperfect faith shall be imputed, and whether it be or can b: imputable, and as *doe this* was prove the minor.

Servants are indebted to Masters, Ephes. 6. 5. obedience with feare and trembling, wives, husbands: He declined doing justice, refused the office of a King, &c.

That our Lord Christ did what pleased his Father in *Answe.*
our behalfe is unquestioned, the voyce from Heaven was,
In whom I am well pleased, Matth. 3. *that we are accepted in*
the well-beloved, Eph. 1. It is said he came to fulfill the Law,
Matth. 5. and Matth. 3. *That as it became him be fulfilled*
all righteousness. In fulfilling the Law, there is no place for want. In *all righteousness*, there is that which was due by all sorts without exception, the debt of all, was but all righteousness; all this not for himselfe, but us, because he lived from the first moment and needed it not, because he was our Surety, bound to pay our whole debt. It was of him our great Mediator, as p. 108. I suppose that *in Christ there is neither bond or free, male or female, King nor Begger, all are one in Christ,* Gal. 3. 28. which is inferred from this, that *as many as are baptized into Christ, have put on Christ, and we are all the sonnes of God by faith in Jesus Christ.*

Christ is he who knitteth Jewes and Gentiles together in one body of the seed of Abraham; therefore all taketh away the difference of persons, of which by and by, vers. 28. whosoever, vers. 27. is that the difference of the state of the Gentiles and of seue may be taken away, as it appeareth from the next vers. That putting on of Christ

Christus est qui Iudeos & Gentes in unum corpus feminis Abrahæ connectit; itaque *ad regnū,* tollit personarum discrimen, de quo mox, vers. 18. quicunque vers. 27. ut tollatur gentium status & sexus discrimen, sic ut appareat ex sequenti versu Metaphora sumpta à vestibus ad diximus *Luc.* 24. 49. & alibi sive, sed quia mysterium nostrum cum Christo coniunctionis, quasi oculis subiicitur. Oponet enim Ecclesiam Christi tanquam veile quadam operari & sub eo deli-

recesserat sancta sit prouersus & inculpabilis, *is a metaphor taken from clothes as we said, Luke 24. 49. and elsewhere often, but such as may set the mystery of our union with Christ before our eyes;* for the Church must be covered with Christ as it were with a garment, and lie hid under him that it may be wholly holy and without blame, Ephes. 5. 27. *and therefore the Apostle signified the seede of Abraham by the one name of Christ.*

Omnes homines, velint, nolint, sunt unū, id est unas specie renatus—unum individuum quasi ut in Christo serventur—per cum ipsum Christum.—*Sed hoc deum scendum, nos per fidem Christo ipsi uniti Spiritus sancti vincula ut bonorum ipsius namus participes, ut omnes fideles hac ratione sint unas Christus mysticus, ut loquuntur etiam Apostolus, 1 Cor. 12. 12. Eccl. in loc.*

Sensus est, nihil hic valeat personas, Unus estis, quo significatur sublatum esse discrimen, Caius.

Est illis omnia meritoria; nam dum sunt una persona mystica cum Christo, illis imputari meritum passionis, mortis, obedientiae, justitiae, & sic factus est illis adeo sapientia, justitia, sanctificatio & redemptio, 1 Cor. 3. 30. Daven. in Col. 3. 11.

the faithfull in this respect are one mysticall Christ, as the Apostle also speaketh, 1 Cor. 12. 12.

The sense is, that here persons availe nothing, You are one, in which be signifieth the difference to be taken away.

He is all things to them meritoriously, for whilst they are made one mysticall person with Christ, he giveth to them the merit of his passion, death, obedience, righteousness, and so is made unto them of God wisdome, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, 1 Cor. 1. 30.

It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell, saith the Apostle, Col. 1. 19. Hence are they presented holy, unblamable, and unreprovable in Gods sight, v. 22. and yee are compleate in him, c. 2 10.

And let your next Chapter be read, and see whether there can be any defect for any man, where there is so much and so great abundance.

He that is arraigned in this, and presents himselfe before God, is so say you. Not in the habit of a just or righteous man, but in the glorious attire that makes men just and righteous, the great

great Mediator of the world, whose righteousness bath beateth and despiseth in it, a length and breadth which infinitely exceedeth the dimensions and proportions of all men whatsoever.—The glory of this righteousness doth transcend the condition of the creature.—All the parts of this righteousness, all the acts of obedience that be performed, be performed them as one that had received the spirit without measure; there was a righteousness and worth in them which did fully answer the fulness of that grace that was given him above all his fellowes, &c. p. 108.

109. 10.

You object to your selfe, *love is the fulfilling of the Law, Christ's perfect love, is a perfect fulfilling the Law; and therefore being imputed may serve, though some acts of obedience wanting.* To this purpose you object; but Sir, we say not that there is any thing wanting.

1. You answer, *love may be an Evangelicall fulfilling the Law and accepted, yet holds not out weight and measure for any mans justification in the covenant of works.*

But to no purpose, that objection urgeth not our love but Christ's, and not therefore justification by a covenant of works, but of grace by Christ.

And it will not follow that if his love be imputed, other acts of righteousness were vaine, for what you call other, are no other then love, so all are acts of righteousness.

2. I answer to the second, that the love of Christ is the fulfilling of the whole Law (both Tables.)

3. I answer thirdly, that love (as you grant) being a cause of the being of the rest, and having (what you call) the rest virtually in it, *a spirituall unsigne[n]d affection of love is an inward principle of that nature which inclineth and disposeth a man to the performance and practice of all manner of duties required in the Law.* Grant Christ's lovethis: It will not be ridiculous to say his love is imputed for their righteousness. For being a cause and virtually including fulfilling, it will serve. It is more to be a cause then to fulfill the Law, and love consisteth not onely in affection but acts themselves, they are love in words and deeds.

And there is somewhat in it when as Paul professeth

Proprie[re] quod
unumquodque
estuale illud est
magis tale.

his life to be by faith in the Son of God who hath loved me and given himselfe for me, in which there are both his active and passive obedience, 2 Gal. 20. and the objects of his faith.

2. You object, *It is sufficient though there be what is equivalent to such particular acts of righteousness, and answer.*

1. *The Law must have jot for jot, tittle for tittle, point for point, letter for letter, otherwise it hath a curse.*

1. I answer, not questioning but Christ yeelded jot for jot, tittle, &c. *He infinitely exceeded the dimensions and proportions of all men whatsoever, as you : where is more, there are jots and tittles.*

But Sir, How shall your faith not taking in this righteousness of Christ, nay opposed, be jot for jot, &c. and how will Gods judgement be according to truth, if that be instead of *doe this*?

2. And secondly, I answer to the second, that the acts of Christ imputed are the acts of him that was our *Surety*, which infinitely exceeding the dimensions and proportions of all men whatsoever, serve the necessities of all men whatsoever ; every mans turne is served here, even that which the Lord requireth of him, to omit that those differences are taken away.

3. You object to your selfe equivalence in his doings or in his sufferings, *the debt was eternall death, he paid it by what was not eternall, but equivalent, and so might by doing.* And answer.

1. Denying those words *I thou shalt die the death, must of necessity meane eternall death, according to the letter.*

2. Neither that nor by way of equivalencie, was not Gods meaning, but the evill of punishment represented and knowne to him by the name of death, without consideration of duration. I answer.

1. Sir, to die the death is such a punishment, which though it hath not eternity of its nature, yet it hath eternity a concomitant as your selfe out of *Scotia*, and that is in it selfe (because of concomitancy) for ever, the freedome from it is accidentall. It is eternall in the threat, as is seene in execution on Devils and wicked men, it had beeene so to us if our *Surety* had not borne it, and beeene on him

him for ever had he not overcome it.

3. But then you answer, 3. that though God did take liberty to vary from the curse, and to use equivalency, it followeth not God should accept such legall payment as is equivalent.

I answer (still premising that Christ yeelded compleat satisfaction as before) that if God did vary in the curse, he received legall payment which is equivalent, death was legall payment, and doing you object is but legall payment; *The soule that sinneth shall die*, is the voice of the Law.

To that you farther adde of God that having received a full satisfaction of all the transgressions of the Law he may by a second covenant accept of what he pleaseth to instate men in this benefit, which is to bimevivalent to perfect legall righteousness.

I answer, that which Christ paid being the full satisfaction of the Law, answereth our debt compleatly, and there is no need of any thing else to be accepted, (It is injurious indeed) that is equivalent to compleat legall righteousness, that satisfaction of righteousness onely graciously imputed to us as performed by our Surety for us, is enough. Faith indeed hath the place of an instrument or hand receiving what is accounted or given, by which applied I am just, and so have privileges; but hath no equivalence to the righteousness of the Law, as in it selfe, in justification, excluding the righteousness of Christ as you hold it out; and the satisfaction of the Law by Christ our Surety, to such a faith is what God doth by the covenant of grace.—

To what you adde more, that may suffice which I have already spoken, I will hasten to your 10. chap.

CHAP. X.

2. Ground, thur.

THAT righteousness which is exactly and precisely fitted to the person and office of him that is Mediator between God and

and man or Redeemer of the world cannot be imputed to any other for his righteousness.

But such is the righteousness of Christ: Therefore the minor opening the riches of the righteousness of Christ is granted, and use made of it in the former argument as destructive to its pretended unfitness in our Sureties righteousness.

To the major I answer, by denying it, the precise and exact righteousness of Christ our Mediator can be and is imputed to us, we are clothed with the robes of Christ's righteousness, his righteousness which hath heights and depths, &c. so that according to the truth (as Doctor Prideaux explaineth our tenet) we are equally just because with the same righteousness, in that we are as just as if we had personally performed it our selves.

1. Yet, 1. Rob him not because we are found herein by his consent and commandement of application, by his giving and his enabling us by faith to apply the same.

Eque justi sumus quoad veritatem, quia eadem justitia; licet non aequaliter ex eadem modo, cum ille justus sit subiectus, cause with the same righteousness; nos imputative; ille de proprio, nos de illius largitate.

2. For the equality, he that affirmeth we are for truth equally just, before God, though not equally and in the same manner, seeing he is just subiectively, we imputatively, be of his own, we of his bounty, openeth our fense for equality. Doctor Ames answering Bellarmine, layeth downe our tenet.

Christi justitiam tamen nobis imputari, ut eius virtute nos perinde justi censemur coram deo ac si nosmet ipsi in nobis habemus quo justi coram ipso censemur. Christi righteousness is so far imputed unto us, that we are by virtue thereof accounted just before God as if we our selves had in our selves that whereby we are accounted just before him. And then,

Justitiam Christi imputari singulis secundum eorum particularem necessitatem, non every one according to their particular secundum universalem quem habet value necessity, not according to the universal value thereof.

Whence you may see how we take and take not that robe of unmeasurable majesty upon us, and how much you are deceived, and deceive when as you imagine that, and

Juxta veritatem
æque justi sumus,
quia eadem
justitia, de
justis. p. 171.

and thereby grieve the truth; the generation of disputers teach you otherwise, Doctor Pridesaux, Doctor Ames, and so Doctor Davenant proposeth it.

It is to be weighed that Christ's righteousness is not imputed to this putari huic aut illi credenti scandum totam and thus be'ever according to the latitudinem efficaciz fuz, sed prout unaus whole latitude of its efficacie; but so quisque ea opus habet.
as every one bath need of it.

And that may answere what is urged, p. 110. and we avoid presumption or blasphemy, and sheweth what a communicableness we hold measured onely by our need; (Let the Reader see more in the former part) and so conceive what every member receiveth from Christ the head, and how that is used. The head infloweth according to the need of every member, and the member receiveth so much, so much as maketh us perfectly just, perfectly holy in the sight of God. The imputation of which your argument teacheth not.

When as you say, p. 113. that Christ with his members are a body onely by way of resemblance. If withall you acknowledge our Union true and reall in its kinde it shall suffice, if otherwise, you must with Mr. Wotton answere the charge Mr. JV. laieth on you before.

CHAP. XI.

A third Ground, p. 119.

There is no necessity of this imputation of Christ's righteousness, he that is compleatly justified by having his sinnes forgiven, is justified without the imputation of this active obedience of Jesus Christ. Mr. G.

You say this proposition is generally granted, but you begge it, for those that contend for imputation of Christ's righteousness, active or passive, both, make it the cause of remission of sinnes, as before.

But a belieuer is sufficienly justified before God by the remission

E e

A.

G.

sin of sinnes; therefore I conclude there is no need, &c. this you say was proved, c.5.

And there you have answer.

Then you object to your selfe, that remission is but a part of justification, not the whole, and that imputation of righteousness must be added.

To answer which, you cite *Calvyn*. Let what you say and I answer before, be considered by the Reader, and he shall see your head and his opinion at oddes. He maketh remission an effect, See l. 3. c. 14. Sect. 12, *hac nos instruisti*, &c. There shall you see your rashnesse in that assertion, and the maintenance thereof, and *Pareus* his testimony against himselfe, and your vanity in urging their objection as arguing a diverse tenet amongst Protestants, by both *Pareus* and Doctor *Davenant*, &c.

When you p. 127. excuse your imputation of faith in a proper sense being the same, that justification stands in remission of sinnes only.

I answer, it is vaine, for faith in a proper sense without a Trope, justifieth with you both, and they say that justification consisteth (a) in regeneration and remission of sinnes; you make them the same, both of you dispute against imputation of Christs righteousness, which yet is the Protestant tenet (*Piscator*, *Pareus*, Mr. *Gataker* not excepted, who teach the imputation of Christs passive obedience.)

Neither doe the Scriptures expressly demonstrate it, *Rom. 4.6.7.* nay *vers.6. & 1.1.* there is a manifest and expresse imputation of righteousness as well as not imputation of sinne, and that they are cause and effect is shewed by Authors in the same place; and as for that Synecdoche, it is not so needfull there, seeing there is such an expresse of both imputation of righteousness, and non-imputation of sins.

When bloud is mentioned, it is by that figure, and it doth not exclude other parts.

(b) In naming bloud only, he would not exclude other parts of redemption, but rather under one part comprehend the whole, so by the figure Synecdoche the whole expiation is meant.

- (a) In regeneration & remissione peccatorum.
- (b) Sanguinem autem solum nominando non volunt alias redempcionis partes excludere, sed porius sub una parte totam summam comprehendentes; sic per synecdoche tota expiatio nominatur, ad *Rom. 3.24. Calv.*
- So *Ezechard* p. 398 fasci. controver. who citat. *Tielcar.* p. 148. *Bucan.* p. 337. & *Ustini.* p. 8. 452.

Who faith, when we come to Christ, first there is found the exact righteousness of the Law, which also by imputation is made ours.

Ubi vero ad Christum venimus est, pri-
mum in eo invenitur exacta Legis iustitia
qua per imputationem etiam nostra fit. Gal. 3. 31.

And thence answer may be given, that when we are said to be justified by Christs bloud, Rom. 5. 9. the active obedience is not to be excluded. You see it is *Calvines* Doctrine, and so *Bucanus de justif. ad Q. 15.* nay your selfe make this an essentiaall requisite, as afterwards.

What is said of *Supply by adoption*, as you referre us to the next chapter, we will referre thither our answer.

Neither need you argue against your adversaries, as separators and dividers of the active and passive obedience of Christ, and such a putting them into parts, it is but your owne conceipt.

If there be absurdity, it is your owne, who exclude the active obedience, and so separate and divide them. We confess, in your words, that the active obedience of Christ will not profit men if they separate it from the passive, John 12. 14. neither will the passive it selfe be found it selfe, that is an atonement or expiation for sinne, according to the will and purpose of God, except we bring in the active to it, &c. you wound your selfe, not us, in that, and what followeth.

Finally, neither will it follow that the formall cause is double, but one; Christs obedience active and passive, not to be divided or separated, is the matter, it imputed supplieth the place of a forme and constituteth us righteous, as Saint Paul himselfe, Rom. 5. 19. and so must you interpret that place, or else separate and divide, offend in the very thing you reprove (though causelessly.)

CHAP. XII.

4. Reasons, p. 136.

THAT which dissolves and takes away the necessitie and use of that *mutual* and *Evangelicall* grace of adoption, can-

not hold a straight course with the truth of the Gospel. But this imputation in the sense contraverted dissolves and takes away, &c. the necessity of adoption. Therefore.

You say the minor is evident, that we introduce this imputation of Christ's righteousness, that we may have a title to life or Heaven, according to the tenor of the covenant, Hoc fac & vives.

By remission we say accrues no right, and that truly, therefore we compell the righteousness of Christ to take this honour; neither is another use conceivable of it, then to qualifie men to Heaven, which is proper to adoption, this is to frustrate the purpose and counsell of God, &c.

1. I answer, imputation of righteousness, righteousness making, giveth a title to life or Heaven; if regeneration doth so which is but imperfect (wherein yet adoption is founded) perfect righteousness given and received much more, which is of the twaine, the chiefeſt foundation of adoption: *the Spirit is life because of righteousness*, Rom. 8.10. which learned Chamier interpreteth of imputed righteousness, *those that receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, shall raigne in life*, Rom. 5.17. By the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all to justification of life, vers. 18. Grace raignes through righteousness to eternall life, vers. ult.

2. Yet we say not according to the tenour of that covenant, *Doe this and live*, that is by personall performance, righteousness of Christ imputed is of another, yet ours, given and received, establishing the Law; see Calvin on Rom. 3. ult. cited but now, and ad Rom. 10. 5.

Hunc scriptulum optime discutit cum ex ipfa Legis Doctrina fidei justitiam— est autem locus ex Lev. 18.5. ubi dominus vitam eternam pollicetur iis qui Legem suam servaverint.— Atque ita deficiuntur co-

He doth excellently dispell that scruple, when as out of the very Doctrine of the Law be established the Doctrine of faith—the place is taken out of Lev. 18. 5. where the Lord promises eternall life to those that shall keepe Calv.

his Law—and so compelled by their owne defell, should learne to fly to Christ.

3. We say not we have no right by pardon, and it is not

not true, seeing I finde that concurring as the consequent of righteousnesse, Rom. 5. the places you cited; especially if *be that is freed from sinne is ipso facto made perfectly and compleatly righteous*, as you conclus. part. 2. p. 4. *He that is free from death and no waies obnoxious therunto, cannot but be conceived to have a right to life, there being no middle condition betwene life and death*; and conclus. 5. p. 8. where speaking of adoption and title thereby, you say the *Scriptures seeme to give it to that*.

We deny it not to adoption, when as we give it to righteousness imputed, we exclude not Gods gracious dignifying, no we give a place to every grace, faith, hope, love; which have the promises of Salvation. We conceive adoption will not in its claime exclude the righteousness of Christ imputed, which is the maine thing: we be heires of the promises, all, of righteousness lapt up in the promise thereof.

Noah was an heire of the righteousness, which is by faith, Heb. 11. 7. that is, the righteousness which faith apprehendeth, and that is that which God imputeth or giveth, Christs, so that adoption doth not exclude it.

Yea, we read that the promise was not made to Abraham that he shoulde be the heire of the world, or to his seede through the Law, but through the righteousness of faith, Rom. 4. 13. in which the promise of heire-ship is made to him by that, as it were antecedent. I will not contend againt adoption title, and you must beware you contend not againt the title which is by the righteousness of faith, and beware of your conclusion of its being proper to adoption or consequences against such pregnant Scriptures. Indeed salvation is by faith in Christ, hence adoption, participation of righteousness to justification, to salvation. You cannot exclude the death of Christ from being a cause of our salvation, nor reasonably leave out the active obedience of Christ, its essentiall requisite; neither is of force to that end, but as given and received, which is imputation to the beleever.

And hereby you may perceive your errorr, 1. in making
E. c. 3. king.

king these of divers and contrary natures.

2. In that you make the righteousness of Christ, which is another's, our Sureties, graciously performed for us, and given unto us, Evangelicall, to be Legall.

3. Consider whether you be not too wise in arguing the vanity of the one from sufficiencie of the other, when as God hath joyned them together, when as they are subordinate to that effect: adoption is founded in regeneration that new birth which qualifieth to justification, but much more in imputed righteousness, which alone is perfect righteousness; which justification qualifieth to life, whom be justified be glorified.

All the distinct graces in which adoption is founded, make up a plurality of meanes qualifying to justification, to pardon and life. It is very false that nature hath not a concurrence of many causes to effects, the sunne and man, male, female, not to exclude God who is the first. It is very false that God in the Gospel still allowes but one meane for one purpose, the Word, Sacraments, Prayer, Communion, and Saints, &c. are all ordained to the strengthening of our faith, and to our salvation. Neither doth the Lord complaine of plurality of meanes, but of such as are none of his, or contrary, such is legall righteousness, personall obedience: so the places, Rom. 4. 14. Gal. 3. 18. & 21. Gal. 2. 21. where yet vers. 20. he professeth his life of faith in the Sonne of God, loving him, and giving himselfe for him. The Law is opposed to grace, Christ, the promise, faith, Christ and his righteousness, neither to grace nor promise, they are subordinate, all Evangelicall as in that text. See that you be not one that laugh these to scorne.

And see whether your faith in a proper sense be not under your owne lash, opposed professedly to the righteousness of Christ; from the position of one subordinate to the negation of another established by God, is a vaine and frivolous argumentation.

And see p. 143.
the text cited,
Ecclesiasticus 11. 6.

CHAP. XIII.

5. and 6. *Grounds*, p. 145.

IT dissolves the necessity of repentance, the righteous bath no need of repentance.

I deny what is assumed, a Christian compleat in Christ, white as Snow, whiter, yet needeth repentance, hath it to qualify him to the promise of righteoufinesse, justification, remission: as it supposeth faith, which alone justifieth, so repentance qualifying faith, and conditioning the person, that faith that justifieth is not alone, those that are sanctified are perfected for ever, the same Spirit sanctifieth and justifieth at the same time.

If it stood in an universall non-imputation of unrighteousnesse or pardon, is not such a man perfectly righteous, as your selves teach; are they not *contraria immediata*, as your selves urge? yet you teach need of repentance daily, as qualifying the subject to the promise; there is the same reason: here pardon supposeth in deed imputation of righteousness by which our sinnes are not imputed, therefore it is that they stand not guilty of any sinne before God.

Yea, we assert they have the rights and priviledges accompanying such a righteousness not in possession, but in Christ their head, in the promise which abideth for ever, by faith and hope, as the man, perfect by non-imputation of unrighteousnesse; he hath right to life, *he bath everlasting life, John 3. 36.* and yet that consistent with sinne, where there is no condemnation, nay, everlasting life, there is a lawlesse Law, &c. Yea there is an imperfect faith which is not without sinne.

When as p. 148. you tell us of the intrinsecal and formal property of a worke of the Law, that it hath power to justifie out of internall worth and dignity. You agree not with truth, which teacheth that when a man bath done all, he must say, *he is an unprofitable servant, doing but what he ought,*

ought, nor with your selfe, p. 191. He bath done what was duty to doe : and this by our Saviours rule, Luc. 17. 10. makes but an unprofitable servant, i. (I conceive) It is no ground to demand or challenge any great matters at his Masters hand, except it be by covenant or promise from him : these are your words.

It taketh away the necessity of his death.

It doth not, but establish it, by both these imputed a believer is justified, indeed had he Beene so before this imputation, or not by it and with it, sonewhat might be said, now nothing against it, the righteousnesses of the Law, Gal. 2. 21. is personall, *the man that doth it shall live*, Christs imputed, is not legall.

And what you talk of imputableness of Christs active obedience, without his deaths is ignorance, that his obedience was to beginne with life, and to end in death ; and you forget now your former doctrine of concurrence of active and passive obedience, and absolute necessity of both to make atonement, and that both make up but one obedience and satisfaction.

When you argue against the imputableness of this righteousnesses of Christ by a question ; *Why should not men be capable of imputation thereof in the middest of their sins, as well as Christ was capable of imputation of their sinnes, in the middest of his righteousnesses?*

I answer, First, it is impertinent to our question. Secondly, the reason is, the inconsistencie of justification and wickednesse. Thirdly, *abomination to the Lord*, and the promise of God requireth a lively faith to participation of the same, receiving it, and making it ours, the promise is made unto a believer repenting. I. 1. 16.

CHAP. XIV.

7. Ground, p. 151.

IMPUTATION, &c. leaves no place for remission of sinnes, though it be quoad veritatem, non quoad modum, *or some of that*
way

waye binke to distinguish themselves safe.

The major is Doctor Pridesesse's, as before, and the assumption is false from the position of a cause, to the denyall of the effect, as the learned; as Mr. Gataker also, though in somewhat not agreeing with them, acknowledgeth forgiuenesse of sinnes to be so, or a consequent.

And in truth when as God imputeth Chrits righteousness, and pardoneth them, they have no more sinne then Christ to be pardoned; all are pardoned, these are *contraries immediata*, and you know there is no third or middle: though not in the same manner Christ was, yet *quoad veritatem*, and thus for this argument.

The exception and answer you make of remitting first, and then imputing, is a fancie of your owne to be neglected. Both are together for time, the order is imputation of righteousness, just making, then remission of sinnes.

You object by way of addition, that *Christ bath taught us to pray for remission after this imputation, unlesse it be taught infidels onely, but to aske forgiuenesse and concerne our selfes as righteous as Christ, is rather to mocke God, then worship him.*

I answer, that petition for pardon after justification is Chrits ordinance, whether justification consisteth in imputation of righteousness or pardon, it mattereth not to that, all must doe it.

2. That by justification (whether it consist in one or other) it is conseit that person is perfectly righteous.

3. That he that doth so doth not mocke God, seeing it is obedience to that commandement, seeing it is Gods way whereby pardon is sued out to the quiet of a mans conscience.

4. That the same is as much against your selfe, who make it to stand in remission of sins, unlesse you think your selfe not thereby perfectly righteous, or being so, not bound to use that prayer; answer your selfe, and you shall save us a labour.

5. Finally, what you object against us, holdeth against imputation of faith in your sense, for let faith be righteousness or not; if it be by Gods acceptation, as *doe and*

live to justification, and I am by it interested in all the priviledges of a just man. Why may not I be said to mock God (when as I conceive my selfe as perfectly righteous in Gods account) in asking pardon, as in being so indeed? I doe but suppose: there is as full a justification, as perfect a deliverance from death and condemnation, as in the former case, as yourselfe grant.

Besides, the question is not of being of sin or of perfection of sanctification, this is denied on both sides, and sinnes being is graunted, though not imputed, and so though righteousness be imputed, and thence no imputation of sinne.

Neither is the righteousness of Christ imputed a legall righteousness as hath beeene shewed, that is, personall *doing this*, being it another thing is consistente with sinne exceptio-

CHAP. XV.

If it were Christ's it would have no compliance with that error, that God seeth no sinne in his people.

How doe you prove that it hath compliance?

*W*hosoeuer is perfectly righteous, in him God can see no sin, but every believer is so by the imputation of Christ's righteousness: therefore.

Leaving here your loose Rethorick, which is truely applicable to your selfe.

I answer, by a distinction, which I will premise first, and then apply.

God may be said to see sinne either with a simple sight, or else to impute or punish it: the former was on my knowledge his error, the latter is a truth, as we shall see.

Out of Zanchy long agone I answered him, for the words

Dieimus etiam Deum ita firmam tenere are; We say also, that God bath so omnium scientiam ut omnia sint semper e- firme a knowledge of all things, that all jus aperta oculis, & in conspectu ihsus i- things are alwayes open to his eyes, and si oblivio. Nam quod sacris Scripturis ex- present in his sight, that he can forget nothing;

nothing; for what is often said in the holy Scripture, that God forgetteth our sinnes, that he hath covered them, and cast them into the bottome of the Sea; These and such like sayings are not to be understood of knowledge simply, as if God knew them no more, but of a judicall knowledge to punishment, that he will not bring them against us in judgement, but forgive them. And this is that which Augustine on the 31. Psal. Blessed are they whose sinnes are covered; if God bath covered them, he would not perceive them, if he would not perceive them, he would not consider them; if he would not consider them, he would not punish them, he would not acknowledge them, he would rather pardon them; for what is it for God to see sin, but to punish sin?

I answer, he that is made just by the righteousnesse of Jesus Christ, in him God can see no sinne to punish, that is all that followeth, and here is no compliance with that error which was for a simple sight.

Where there is pardon of all sinnes by imputation of active or passive obedience, one, or both; the same followeth that God seeth no sinne in that man to punish, and I hope that hath no compliance; free your selfe, you cleare our tenet by the same labour.

It is one thing for sin to be, another to be imputed or punished, and so to be righteous, that sin may not be, and that it may not be imputed justification respecteth not the being simply, but being in force, binding to punishment: justification respecteth the latter only, though there be a destruction of the being of sinne, and it is further *in fieri*, and shall have an utter abolition by vertue of fellowship with Christ, yet that falleth not under our question.

There is an *ultra* (I see) to the line of your apprehension, and herois no Riddle.

sepe dicitur, Deum obliuisci iniquitatum nostrorum & peccata nostra esse illi recta, item ea projecta in profunda maris, haec & alia id genus dicta non sunt intelligenda de simpli cognitione Dei, quasi Deus ea non amplius nolit, sed de cognitione judiciali ad praem, quod nolit sc. ea contra nos in judicium proferre, sed condonare: atque hoc est quod Aug. in 31. Psal. Beati quorū recta sunt peccata; si exit peccata Deus, noluit adverte: si noluit adverte: noluit animadverte: si noluit animadverte: noluit punire, noluit agnoscere; quid est enim Deus videre peccata nisi punire peccata?

See Zanob. de natura Dci, l. 3. c. 2. q. 14. p. 216. & Polan. Synt. c. 35. similiter.

CHAP. XVI.

A ninth demonstration is an bespe indeed of flanders

Such is the leader, i. That it is true that many that hold the way of imputation are not ashamed, nor afraid to confound the two Covenants of God, of Workes and Grace. That God never made more Covenants then one; that the Gospel is nothing else but a gracious aide or relife from God to helpe man out with the performance of the Covenant of workes: so that that life and salvation which is said to come by Christ, shall in no other sense be said to come by him, but onely as be fulfilled the Law of works for man; and such is that of their inheriting life and salvation according to the strict and rigid tenour of the Law, Doe this.

These are your demonstrations foundation, the rest are superstructures; to answer them were to fight with a shadow: this I answer without demurring. I professe I never read man that did hold those tenets as laid downe by you.

We give to Gods grace in Christ the whole salvation of beleivers, beginning, consummation, adoption, justification, pardon, sanctification, mortification, graces, exercise, growth, perfection, the saving of the soule and glorious resurrection.

We give all to free grace, we say it is founded in another, a Surety, Jesus Christ satisfying Gods justice in our behalfe. We teach the death of Christ, nay, the necessity of his incarnation, his taking our nature, doing and suffering in the forme of a servant, obeying to death; the necessity of his resurrection, ascension, and sitting at Gods right hand.

We say to our justification his righteousness or obedience active and passive are necessary, they are the materiall cause, we teach the imputation of both, so the stremme, they are but few that exclude the active; none but you, Mr. Wotton, Arminius, &c. deny imputation simply; you admit

admit of servile obedience to the Law; Yea, of the active part, necessarily concurring to make the passive an atonement, we to make the satisfaction full. We teach the subject a beleever in Jesus Christ: finde these in the Covenant of workes, and then I will yeeld I am out.

You object to your selfe, *the righteousnesse of Christ imputed, and the Law personally wrought by a mans selfe are differing conditions;* and answer, *the substance of the agreement is still the same, righteousnesse of the Law are that same by whomsoever wrought.*

1. I answer, there is more then obedience to the Law, in doing; there is dying, so that there is no sainenesse.

2. The Lawes condition was, *the man that doth,* it is not here so, it is not the same. It is beleeving,taking in the object, another, a Sureties righteousnesse.

3. If *Adam* had fulfilled the Law, he had not beene justified with the same righteousnesse beleevers are, that you should have proved.

To what followeth, we say not Gods imputation is the condition of the Covenant, but faith taking in the object Christs obedience, and we say they justifie not as workes simply, so they have the place of the matter thereof of onely, they concurre materially with the sufferings of Christ; and justifie not, but as imputed, neither justifieth, not imputed or not applied:but enough to this was answered in a bare deniall.

CHAP. XVII.

P. 158. 3. *Arguments more.*

THAT for which righteousnesse is imputed to those that believe, that cannot be imputed unto them for righteousnesse. Arg. 1.
But the righteousnesse of Christ is that for which righteousnesse is imputed to those that believe: therefore it selfe cannot be imputed for righteousnesse.

The Major is proved, because it is impossible that the thing merited should be the same thing with that which is the meritorious cause.

I answer, confessing that which is imputed the meritorious cause.

2. Denying that what is merited is the same with the righteousnesse of Christ, that is, justification is not the same with the righteousnesse of Christ imputed, they differ as cause and effect.

The major by your proofe of it in plaine termes is this. *The meritorious cause of justification (for you twice here confound righteousnesse and justification) cannot be imputed for righteousnesse. But the righteousnesse of Christ is the meritorious cause of justification.* Therefore.

I answer, confessing the minor, Christs righteousnesse is the meritorious cause of justification.

Denying your major, and so doe all ours, who teaching the righteousnesse of Christ the meritorious cause, yet hold it that which is imputed. Doctor Davenant.

Revera in justificatione talis causa forma- Indeed in justification such a form
lis ponenda est, que simul & meritoria esse possit: nisi enim continet illam dignitatem in se proper quam homo rite justificatus reputetur, nunquam erit causa formalis per quam justificatus existat in conspectu Dei, De justit. hab. c. 22, p. 312. *mall cause is to be put, which also may be a meritorious cause: for unless it containe in it selfe that worthinesse for which man is rightly reputed justified,* it will never be the formall cause by

which a man is justified in the sight of God.

Your proofe of the major is, that it is impossible that the meritorious cause shoul'd be the same thing wi b wbt is merited. You should have proved it impossible being the meritorious cause to be imputed for justification; here I will leave you sticking, till you expedite your selfe.

If the righteousnesse of Christ be imputed to a believer for righteousnesse in his justification, then the meritorious cause of his justification is imputed unto him for righteousnesse. But the meritorious cause of a mans justification cannot be ibus imputed unto him.

This denied before you prove, because the meritorious cause being a kinde of efficient, as the righteousnesse of Christ is, cannot be either the matter or forme of justification.

1. It may be the forme, as out of Doctor Davenant; nay if it were not worthy it could not justify, not every righteous-

righteousnesse, not our owne, being unworthy ; but that of Christ being onely worthy, is that by which imputed we are justified.

2. It may be the matter, and so is it commonly termed by Divines. See *Pareus* on *Vrfinus* his Catech. *Christ's satisfaction is the materiall cause of our righteousness*. See *Calv.* whom you bring as opposing himselfe, where this shall be spoken to more fully.

And hearken to *Pareus* in the same place, whom you elsewhere pretend your friend, and you shall finde him in direct opposition.

We are justified by the merit of Christ, partly of the materiall cause of justification in so much as we please God by the obedience of Christ applied unto us, and as clothed with it or with a garment are accounted righteous; partly by an impulsive cause outwardly moving and meritorious, as for that he absolveth us.

It is in both against you, and if the matter had not due worth it would never doe the worke. It must be a sufficient price that maketh satisfaction paid by a Surety for mans ransome, or else it is worth nothing to that effect : It were not such righteousness as God would accept. It applied would not effect justification, and that which is the effect thereof remission of sinnes.

And for your axiome read *Pareus*. *Christ hath divers considerations to our justification, 1. as the subject in which our righteousness is, 2. as an adjuvant cause, because he obtaineth it, 3. as the principall efficient, because together with the Father he justifieth and giveth faith by which we believe — Christ's satisfaction is the materiall cause of our righteousness.*

Himselfe also calleth the imputation of Christ's righteousness the formall cause often times, not in the Papists sense, as inhering in us, that it doth in Christ, in which sense

*Satisfactio Christi est causa materialis justitiae nostrae, ad q. 6.
P. 355.*

Christus varie se haber ad justificationem nostram, 1. ut subjectum in quo est iustitia nostra, 2. ut causa adjuvans, quia impetrat, 3. ut efficiens principale, quia una cum patre justificat & dat fidem, qua credimus — Satisfactio Christi est causa materialis justitiae nostrae, ib.

sense he denieth it the formall cause, *Castig. de justif. p. 469.* and addeth that remission of sinnes is made by perfect righteousness imputed. And as for the finall cause, questionleſe there is the glory of Christ as Mediator, which is enough to infringe your inviolable Law; and you should remember you are in an action, where matter and forme properly ſo called have no place, but by analogie, or by ſupplying the place and itead.

And here take notice that your conclusion, that the righteousness of Christ it ſelſe cannot be imputed unto us, as it is Bellarmineſ, ſo Parens giveth it this anſwer: the Antecedent is false and blaſphemous againſt the Scripture, for it denieth that poſſible to be done which the Scripture affirmeth neceſſarily to be done.

The 12. is of affinity with the former.

If the meritorious caufe of our justification be imputed unto us, or may be conceived imputable, then the effects themſelves of this caufe may be imputed to us alſo, and ſo we may be ſaid to have merited our owne justification and ſalvation, and whereby the whole world is justified. Thus we are in the middeſt of Rome inſtead of Hierusalem.

The conſequence is denied, and largely anſwered by the Learned before, and you ſhall finde it Bellarmineſ againſt Protestants; and ſo your ſelſe in urging it, truly, in the middeſt of Rome. To omit it is againſt imputation ſimply, even of the death of Christ alſo, wherein you are deferted by Parens and Mr. Gſt. left with your friends Arminiuſ and Sociniuſ.

CHAP. XVIII.

Three further reaſons. Argu. 13.

G.

If the active obedience of Christ be in the letter and formalized by it imputed unto me to my justification, then am I reputed before God to have wrought that righteousness in Christ.

But I am not reputed by God to have wrought this righteousness in Christ: therefore.

Passing

Passing your language, letter formality, and other expressions, I answer in the words of our Homily, *He for them fulfilled the Law in his life, so that in him and by him every true Christian man may be called a fulfiller of the Law; for as much as that which their infirmity lacked, Christ's justice hath supplied.* Homil. p. 15. The performance of the Surety for me is accepted as if my selfe had done it.

Against this you argue, *then is Christ in his sufferings reported to have sinned in me,* an assertion uncomely and unChristian.

To this I answer, my sinnes were his by imputation, they were laid on him my Surety, and in that sense he was a sinner, as well as a Sacrifice for sinne. And questionlesse a being either in other, union and communion are supposed to his bearing my sinnes, and my having his righteousness. In Gods purpose there was that order, and so when as there is an actuall commutation of sinne and righteousness in Gods purpose he bore the persons of all the elect, obeying and suffering for them, which is then accounted to me when as I am incorporated to him when also my sinnes are reckoned to him, and I am actually freed from them.

Against this supposed imputation I argue, *if the active be, then the passive is imputed also;* for there can be no sufficient reason given why the one should be taken and the other left. But the death and sufferings of Christ are not in the formality and letter of them imputed.

1. We hold the imputation of both. 2. This argument is denied by your friends, and against them, who teach the imputation of the one, and not the other. 3. You are against imputation simply, and so a Socinian, as Mr. G. answereth *Lucius.* But you will prove it.

If the death and sufferings of Christ are imputed to me; then may I be accounted to have died in Christ, but that can at no hand be in letter and formality.

I answer, what my Surety doth for me, is at any barre my act or suffering, his payment is mine, mine or his own, and then he is a sinner, *as he for me fulfilled the Law in his life;*

Gg.

A.

G.

life; so, he for me paid the ransome in his death, as our Homily.

Of which when as I am said to be justified or acquitted, I must needs be a partaker, it must be mine that I may be acquitted; neither doth the Scripture deny it, when as it saith a Christian is dead to sinne. It is a truth to the power, and guilt, or punishment, it is our freedome from either. It excludeth not, but supposeth our infition into his death, *As many of us as are baptized in Christ, are baptized into his death, and are with him, as buried, and raised, dead; he that is dead, is freed from sinne, Rom. 6.* there is a fellowship with his sufferings, Phil. 3. and thence the vertue thereof in justification.

You say we are freely accepted in the beloved, 1 Eph. 6. yet it cost bloud; our iniquities were laid on him, and so by his stripes we were healed, we establish our Surety Christ.

Gods free forgivenesse and punishing our finnes in our Surety is all we urge, as you out of 2 Cor. 5. 21. we suffer not but by him.

Your letter and formality are your potterne, you deceive us, indeed much more your Clients, and so your selfe. Postico falle clientem, it is a Sophisters tricke.

To omit that at no hand, and yet according to the letter and formality, is no hand, and a left hand.

Supposed imputation with you is as Bellar. putative righteounesse.

But then we are justified in part by the ceremoniall law, he was circumcised and kept the passeover. But, &c.

Sir, those were parts of Gods worship, both instituted by him; and so required in the second Commandement, requiring all worship according to Gods word, which bindeth Jewes and Gentiles, thus both are satisfied for, and thus in Christ there is neither Jew nor Gentile, all are one; and your consequences vanish.

Arg. 15.

Answe.

CHAP.XIX.

5. Further Demonstrations.

They must passe for Demonstrations, call them what you will, and that reason and Logicke are friends to your conclusion, and not Rhetorick; as if Reason and Logicke were two things, and you used not your Rhetorick.

Then are our sinnes imputed to Christ in the same manner, in Arg. 16. his death, &c.

But our sinnes are not imputed in that manner.

For then God looketh on him and reputeth him as one that had truly and really provoked him, and sinned against him. But God lookes not on him so, &c.

For then he shoulde looke on him as one truly deserving death. But that God doth not.

Because Christ offered himselfe without spot unto God. He had no spot of his owne, yet was a sinner, and deserved, being our Surety, he was made sinne, our iniquities were his: the Surety is as liable to the Law as the principall, his undertaking maketh it his own debt, and him as deserving. Had he personally sinned, it is true he could not satisfie for us. That denied, now satisfying as a Surety, we are free. Our personals were his by imputation, inherent in us, not in him; and when you grant the punishment his, the Scripture saith the sinnes are so without which he could not have beeorne punished as elsewhere is shewed.

If the righteousness of Christ, &c. then doth God looke upon us as worthy of that justification. But that is an uncleane saying. Arg. 17.

I answer, God looketh on us in the worthinesse of Christ our Surety, and so are we worthy, by his merits imputed.

This is a truth, though our fulfilling the Law be not worthinesse, for we are debtors, it is what we ought, and are but unprofitable servants when we have done all.

Neither is our worthinesse by the merits of Christ imputed,

~~opposed to just grace,~~ (as you object) Rom. 11. 6. grace and Christs blood, and Christs obedience are subordinate. It holdeth against personall worthinesse, not that of our Mediator.

And when as the Scripture saith, *God justifieth the godly:* I hope he that is justified is a beleever, one that hath union and communion with Christ. Yea and repentance too, these qualifie to the promise of pardon of sinnes, *If s. 16. &c.* and they are not in that moment ungodly: that was the state before faith and repentance, and so justification, but is not when God justifieth; to justify the wicked is abomination, God will by no meanes doe it; you will distinguish betwene a beleever and an ungodly man: now faith receiving and applying the righteousness of Christ imputed justifieth not for our worthinesse, but the worthinesse of our Surety, faiths object.

Arg. 18.

If men become formally just by Gods imputation of Christs righteousness unto them, then do men become formally sinfull by the like act of God imputing Adams sinne. But men are not made, &c. for then the act of God should be at the life and soule of that sinne in men. Therefore.

I answer, Christs righteousness imputed is that which is the forme of justification, that which is as a forme giving him that name and esse. And that by Adams sinne imputed I am constituted a sinner, for imputation it selfe, and righteousness imputed wherein your crochet lieth, I suppose the distinction but a vaine strife of words. Wee all consider the righteousness of Christ as the matter, the imputation of God his act applying it, by it applied we are just.

The act of God is not the forme that onely applieth it, by it applied we are just, and so sinners not by that judicary act of God, charging it on us, but it charged.

To omit that by formally, we meane not inherently, righteousness inhereth in Christ and sinne in Adam, and are ours by imputation; by the one imputed we are righteous, and by the other imputed sinners. This is an advantage from an expresse, a meere cavillation.

If righteousnesse consisteth partly in the imputation of Christ's righteousnesse, partly in remission of sinnes, then must there be a double formal cause of justification, and that made up by two severall natures, really differing one from another.

That which justifieth is the righteousnesse of Christ imputed, remission of sinnes is properly the effect and inseparable companion of it.

So the learned, *Calvyn* and *Chamere*, and reason, for, justification being justification, constituting righteousness by Christ's obedience, fully satisfying, freedome followeth.

Calvyn never used your rod, if were to beate himselfe, as is demonstrated (pare that confident word your speech demonstrations) *Calvyn*, *Chamere* interpreting him, giveth it an effect of righteousnesse imputed by which we are justified; besides there is greater opposition betweene righteousnesse infused, and pardon whence inconstistence, then imputation of righteousnesse and remission, which who so denieth to be *Calvyn*, must have a face that cannot blush or be unsound in his senses and intellectualls; if remission be an effect of righteousnesse imputed, and consequent to justification, they must really differ, or cause and effect doe not really differ.

And therefore remission of sinnes cannot be properly called imputed righteousnesse in their judgements.

And when as you say remission may be called imputed righteousnesse, partly because it is no absolute legall or exact righteousnesse, but a righteousnesse by interpretation and construction of favour, and partly because such righteousnesse as it is, it is notwithstanding given in the strength and mediation of the righteousnesse of another, which is Christ.

I answer, remission cannot be called properly imputed righteousnesse. Your reason, because it is not absolute legall righteousnesse, may be better answered, because it is no righteousnesse at all, for righteousnesse is in the kind conformity with God, and the divine Law, righteousnesse is the conformity of the reasonable creature with Lawes appertaining to them: to conclude righteousnesse is conformity with the Law, and conformity with

with the Law is the same: this must be held because we must be justified by the fulfilling of the Law.

2. When as you say it is not text righteousness, we are sure you can have no text for it, and your construction is its corruption, and it is the favour you beare your owne cause.

3. When as you say it is given by the mediation and strengib of the righteousness of another Christ. It must be his righteousness imputed or applied, and but an effect which we speake of before, and the confirmation thereof.

If such imputation be necessary to justification, it is either in respect of the justice of God, because he could not be otherwise just in pronouncing us just, or in respect of mercy, or for saving and advancing some other attribute.

But there is no necessity in respect of these.

You answer your selfe, that it is necessary in respect of Gods justice. And argue against that.

1. There is nothing thereabout necessary by way of satisfaction of justice, since Christs one offering on the Croffe, &c.

Yet there is a necessity that there be an application of that righteousness, else can there be no justification, and were not that done God should justify a wicked man, which is abomination to the Lord; when as the Lord justifying doth to that end apply the righteousness of Christ. Gods judgement is according to truth, justice in God requireth that a man be just, that is, justified, God will not hold a guilty person innocent.

2. You answer, God may or truly pronounce that man righteous that wants a literall or legall righteousness upon him, especially supposing another righteousness, holding any analogy or proportion thereninto, as he may account any mans uncircumcision circumcision, or call the gentile circumcision, or John Baptist, Elias, &c. in these Christ spake truly.

So may God, a man not legally just, having qualification which holdeth proportion with such righteousness in any point, &c.

I answer, we want legall righteousness, that is, our owne personall righteousness, but in Christs righteousness have what God accepteth us in, our Sureties righteousness.

Arg. 20.

G.

A.

G.

ousness is our owne, it is the righteousnesse of God. Such can you name no other that is so indeed, so that the Lord may thereupon justifie when you mention remission of sins; besides, that it is not righteousnesse, conformity to Gods Law, we grant it but as an effect of righteousnesse imputed, of which before.

And when as you in the third place answer that *remission is a true and compleate righteousnesse in the kinde, though it be not a thorough conformity with the Law.* I may answer, *nonne te videt pugnans in loqui?* that which is not a thorough conformity to the Law, is not a compleate righteousnesse; it hath not its nature, it is an effect of righteousnesse imputed Christ's, we are compleat in him, Gods judgement is according to truth, and so is his pronouncing such a man just.

CHAP. XX.

Containing the 21. 22, 23, & 24. Reasons.

P^resuming your Apolgy for further demonstrations, as you call them. Let us heare the demonstrations themselves.

That which having beeene done in our owne persons, could not have beeene our justification nor any part of the righteousnesse by which we could have beeene justified, cannot be made our justification, or any part of it by imputation from another. Arg. 2.

But the righteousnesse of the Law pretended to be imputed from Christ in justification, bsd it were wrought by our selves in our owne persons, could not have beeene our justification or any part of that righteousnesse, nor any part of our righteousnesse by which we were to be justified; therefore the righteousnesse of Christ cannot be made our justification, nor any part of it by imputation.

I will not stand on the altering the state of the question, which is not whether it be our justification or part of it, but whether we be justified by it imputed: the difference is

as.

as cause and effect, and in the minor proposition being our justification and part of the righteousnesse are confounded.

I might dismisse this argument with this note. But I will suppose all right, I answer,

1. We speake not of the active without the passive obedience of Christ, we teach the imputation of both.

2. Performance supposed, is either of man standing or fallen. If standing it could have justified, had Adam done this he had lived. In the sense the major is false, you confess it.

If fallen, the supposition is impossible, Rom. 8.3. and there must be more then action, passion also, which are impossible to a mans selfe. Personall passion could not suffice, so the damned might, there must be doing also, which is impossible.

3. What could not be therefore our righteousnesse and justifie, being done and suffered by another and imputed doth it, that which is impossible in a person, is found in Christ perfect obedience. By his obedience we are constituted righteous, Rom. 5.19.

Aug. 22.

That which men are not bound by any Law of God to doe in their owne persons for their justification, cannot be imputed from another to any such end.

But men are not bound to observe the morall Law to justification, therefore the observation of it by another cannot be imputed to that end.

1. I answer, Doe this, was Gods Law to life: the morall Law must be perfectly performed if it justifie, as you, p. 99. & 103.

Lex eterna, &
eternæ obliga-
tionis.
P. 67.

2. That this is eternally obliging, your selfe call it, *an eternall Law, and of eternall obligation.* And God requireth it still, either by our selves or Surety; had it not beene due of our part, our Sureties obedience untill death, poverty, &c. had beene vaine; but it was for us, our debt. When as our L. required to life, keeping the Commandements, he shewed it a debt, and that he being insolent in his person must looke for a Surety.

The

The Law of faith is sufficient as an instrument applying what the Mediator did and suffered, to put it on; there must be somewhat else, the object of faith, which applied to us, answereth for us that debt, and thus faith establisheth the Law.

Faith properly taken is not Reade *V. finis* againe, and he in termes teacheth you, *Because faith properly is not imputed to righteousness, but the object of faith, or the merit of Christ apprehended by faith*: so he, or Pareus, or both, as 5. object. p. 364. and of another's righteousness, not inhering in us but Christ.

They say, *this also is conformity of the Law, for faith maketh not the Law of none effect, but establisheth it*. This wheel runneth merrily, I will save labour in further oyling of it. It is your owne Rhetorick, and serveth my turne.

If God requires onely faith of men to their justification, then be imputeth this faith unto them thercunto, but God requires onely faith.

I answer, onely faith is faith considered in it selfe properly, or in relation as taking in the object Christ's righteousness, applying it; the former (which you hold) is not all, or Gods condition further then it taketh in Christ's righteousness, which is in deed the condition, as elsewhere I have shewed. So Pareus but now, and all the learned Protestants except Armin. Socin. Mr. W. and Mr. Good. the faith which God requires is an appropriation of the perfect obedience of Christ, by which we are constituted righteous, as the Scripture speaketh, therein alone is the virtue or value; faith is but the instrument applying, which to that end yet is necessary.

And this is the will of God; neither (to answer what followeth) can man receive it but on supposition of Gods imputation and giving; giving and receiving are relates; this wheel runneth as merrily, and will need no more oyling for this argument.

That which was imputed to Abraham for righteousness in his justification, is imputed to other believers also.

Quia pon fides
proprice sed ob-
jectum fidei seu
meritum Chri-
sti fide appre-
hensum impu-
tatur nobis ad
justitiam.
Hec etiam est
conformatio Le-
gis, fides enim
Legem non i-
nanem reddit
sed stabilit.
Rom. 3. 31.
Arg. 23.

But the faith of Abraham was, &c.

And you referre for proofe to the se^eond chapter, where it is sealed by the choicer learning of ancient and moderne, where also we may see the other, of the contrary interpretation, consumed and burnt up with the fire of the triall, &c.

But here you give us Rhetoricke instead of Logicka. Turne what is said on both sides loose, and excepting Senn. Armin. &c. you have not a man with you.

The faith of *Abraham* tooke in the promises, the seed, Christ his righteousnesse, in whom is all happiness, it did justifie, laying hold, and applying his righteousness imputed, vers. 6. & 11. the effect of what is applied is given to the instrument as the whiting of a wall to the brush or pencil, as making rich to the hand of a begger; by a Trope a Metonymy, or a double Trope Metalepsis, relatively, as all ours, see before out of *Sybrandus*; so our Doctor *Davenant* answereth *Bellarmino*, so *Patens*, so *Clementis*.

Fides imputatur ad iustitiam non propter dignitatem virtutis, sed quia apprehendit in promulgatione Evangelii meritum Christi, &c.
p. 271. nam neque actione fidei nostrae intelligamur: sed ea re ratione qua per fidem apprehenditur, qua est Christus cum sua obedientia, iusti consenserit, & sic illud intelligo. Credidit *Abraham*, &c. Gen. 15. 6. quid reputatum? non alio, sed id quod credidit sed et alii loquuntur ipsa fides, non sicut apprehendentis, sed obiecti apprehendit respectu, *Zanch. in Phil. 3. 21*

was reputed? not the object, but that which he believed, or as others speake, faith it selfe, not in respect of it, selse apprehending, but of the object apprehended.

CHAP. XL.

The last Reason.

If the righteousness of the Law be not imputable imderivable (in the letter and formall) of it from one mans person to another,

another) then cannot the righteousness of Christ be imputed to any man in justification after any such manner.

But the righteousness of the Law is not imputable from one mans person to another. Therefore the righteousness of Christ is not imputable (much less imputed) to any man in his justification; this is mentioned with purpose, c. 8. the reason is, that man that doth shall live and no other.

You needed not to name this twice, nor I to answer it more than once; yet I deny the consequence, for the righteousness of Christ is not Legall, but Evangelicall; the Gospel revealeth it, 1 Cor. 1:30, 1 Cor. 1:31, 1 Cor. 1:32, 1 Cor. 1:33.

And then I deny that that righteousness which Christ performed for us is not imputable, or imputed, he was one Surety, performed obedience to death for us, if it be not imputed it is vain, we have no benefit by it. But looking backe, I shall be delver the summe I will stame year over.

The Law requireth perfonall performances, the Gospel admitteth of a Surety, the man that stand in Christ having his righteousness, liveth; By the shedding of ones mans blood righteousness is supposed imputed or given by God and applied by the Spirit of Christ unto the guilty.

You object to your selfe, If the transgression of the Law be imputable from one to another, then may the righteousness of the Law. But the transgression of the Law is imputable from one mans person to another, as Adams sinnes were imputed to him.

By way of answer you first deny the majors consequence, and give reasons.

1. In the tenour of the Law there is no such emphaticall restraint of the guilt or punishment due to the transgression of it to the person, as there is of the reward promised to the observer, as Gal. 3: 12. The man that doth this shall die. In which where found on the other hand, the very man that transgresst him shall die for his transgression.

Did not God say to Adam, In the day that thou eat thereof thou shalt die the death? Gen. 2:17 did you never read, The soul that sinneth it shall die? Exod. 32:14.

2. You answer, giving a difference, that sins deserves greater of punishment then obediencie deserves a reward.

This exception notwithstanding there may be a specificall sameness of reason, and the difference but in a degree, greater lesse; You grant obedience should merit, though not so much, which yet is simply destroyed, when as it is found due, and we having done all are unprofitable servants.

But it cannot be denied, but whole nature was in *Adam*, in his loynes, willing, doing, receiving, as he by covenant, to have beene brought forth in his likenesse, pure and holy as himselfe; had he continued so, as he, uncleane, did bring forth such as are uncleane; more, lesse, merit or not, is not the question, but imputableness: the sameness thereof, you confess it when you put the difference more and lesse, p. 192.

You now come to the imputation of *Adams* sinne, to his posterity, assenning its imputation onely in the merit of it, it is a curse or punishment, and then propose to us certaine conclusions about the same.

The first is, *The Scripture no where affirmes either the imputation of Adams sinne, or of the righteounesse of Christ to those that believe; where ever it is used, it is onely applied to something of the same persons to whom the imputation is made, and never to or of anything of anothers.*

Besides what hath beeene spoken, to which I referre the Reader.

1. This conclusion is against imputation simply of what is anothers, and is for *Armin.* *Socin.* &c. against all Protestants, even such as hold the imputation of Christ's passive obedience, which is anothers.

2. It is against the word which speaketh of imputation of righteounesse, *Rom. 4. vers. 6. & 11.* which I have shewed to be Christ's, and is confuted by the Protestant streme, who interpreting faiths imputation, take faith tropically and include the righteounesse of Christ given or imputed by God. *Parens* his speech is, *quem sexum (metonymicum) si appugnat adversarius certe non Lutherum impugnat sed spiritum suum blasphemat, &c.* and what *Sydr.* teacheth of the same we have heard before.

The priviledges, remission, &c. suppose Christ's righteounesse.

ousness not onely performed, but given and received, as the effect the cauie.

So doth our death for Adams finne, and that finne is ours, the Scripture sheweth we finned in him, and that finne went over all by one mans disobedience; we not onely die, but finne, death passed over all, being all b[ea]t[en] finned, Rom. 5.12. and by one mans offence many are made sinners, verl. 19.

As Adams posterity are implied to be in his loynes to punishment, so to finne whence punishment, and this your selfe often confesse, which by imputation becometh ours, when as we are conceived.

To impute finne, is onely to charge guilt of finne on a man, with a purpose to punish him for it, as Rom. 5.13. not finne it selfe.

I answer, the Scripture chargeth us with both Adams finne and the demerit or guilt thereof, & I would know whether finne and guilt demerit are separable? if not, how there can be guilt charged, and denierit, and not finne, as the finne is, the demerit is, inseparably, though not the charging of it.

Hath many parts, the first is, *That imputation of the righteousness of Christ to believers, or the finne of Adam to his posterity, are expressions at least unknowene to the holy Ghost in Scripture.*

1. The answer is, this was once before named and answered, and must be now neglected. *Hocum the Papist said it of Christs righteousness, you are like him.*

2. You say, you grant there are expressions in Scripture concerning both the communication of Adams finne with his posterity, and the righteousness of Christ with believers, that will fairely enough bear the terme of imputation, if it be rightly understood.

So the termes are granted, the difficulty is about the right sense; thus you destroy what you built before twice in this chapter. Now for the sense.

You say, Rom. 5.19. concerning Adams finne, many are said to be sinners, and righteousness of Christ, many are made righteous, and upon that if the meaning of imputation of Adams

dams sinne to condemnation be that the demerit or guilt of Adams sinne is charged on the whole posterity, a maine part of which punishment of Adams sinne redounded and remaine ever as it were from his person to his whole posterity, a maine part of which punishment is that originall defilement wherein they are all conceived and borne, and thereby are made truly and formally sinners before God. Let it passe. But if the meaning be that sinfull act wherein Adam transgressed in the letter and formality of it; and as it was Adams owne personall sinne it so imputed that his posterity is made formally sinners before any of the part of the punishment come upon them, this imputation you are sure the Scripture will not justify.

I answer, granting the former part, for guilt and punishment, that by which we are formally sinners, that is inherently. But addle that is not all, the act of Adam as well as the demerit, may therefore because the demerit is imputed, and by it as I am formally a sinner by pollution of nature, which is an effect, so am I truly a sinner, thence denominateth, not formally as it inhering, and yet charged on me, with, and as the internall guilt and demerit. So that I am as truly a sinner by imputation of that act, as the effect thereof, so the texts of which before,

1. You plead first the weight of the demerit, or sinfulness of it, demonstrateth the equity of Gods proceedings in binding over Adams posterity, or his person to the same punishment.

2. The narrownesse and scarcenesse of Adams person to bear all that wrath binselfe.

3. The peculiar and mere relation of the posterity of his person, they were in his person, and somewhat of him, when the sin was committed. Adam was all we, we all bore that one Adam. The whole generation of mankinde is but Adam, or but Adams person interpreted.

All these as grounds of Gods equity and just dealing in punishing Adam and his posterity, not largely by himself, and then by Scripture.

And who opposesh you? what is this to the non-his-
putation of his sinne? the texts are cleare we are sinners,
and

and reason that the internal demerit and sinne are inseparable, you call it demerit or sinfulness.

Imputation therefore (say you) if there be any, is of every mans owne sinne in Adam, we being in his loues as Levi in Abraham, not Adams, &c.

If it be our owne, then not the punishment onely but the offence is ours, we are sinners thence as well as from inward pollution: and as it is equall as soone as we exsite that the punishment shoulde be laid on us, and the demerit, so the sinne it selfe, as that for which, which we all conceive to be by Gods imputation or charging it on us.

God righteously punisheth and righteously reputeth me a sinner. And yet it is *Adams* sinne; the sinne of one in Scripture; he onely existing, made ours by Gods just judgement in conception and birth, and that by imputation, which we conceive Gods way of communication which you granted but now, for which there is such equity as you speake of; for more to this head I referre you to what is before largely spoken unto twice to this head, of Orthodox against Pelagians and Papists, and on occasion given in what followeth.

I have done examining the first Treatise, and now come to consider what commission and power you have to disarm and take away the weapons of us whom you call your enemies, your second part: and first to examine your conclusions.

the same time, the author, through his wife, has been
able to get in touch with the author of the original
work, and has obtained from him a copy of the
original manuscript, which he has now made available
to the public. This manuscript is a copy of the original
written by the author himself, and it is in excellent
condition. It is a large volume, containing over 1000
pages of handwritten text. The handwriting is clear
and legible, and the text is well organized. The
author has written in a flowing, fluid style, and the
text is well balanced. The manuscript is in good
condition, and it is a valuable historical document.
The author has written a foreword to the manuscript,
in which he discusses the history of the work and
the significance of the original manuscript. He
has also written a short biography of the author,
and a brief history of the author's life. The
manuscript is a valuable historical document, and
it is a valuable addition to the library of any
historian or researcher.



EXAMINATION of MR. GOODWIN'S CONCLUSIONS.

Being Chapter 1 & 2. of his second part.

VHICH you say Give light to the Question, and serve as foundations and grounds to give answere upon, to Objections made against your discourse.

Concl. 1. He for whose finnes a plenary satisfaction hath bin made (either by himselfe or another for him) and hath been accepted by him, against whom &c. is as just and righteous as he that never sinned, but had done all things meet for him.

1. I answere, a plenary satisfaction respecteth the whole debt: that made and accepted he for whom it's paid is as just as you speak.

2. Acceptation is necessary to a plenary satisfaction for finne, to that perfect righteousness; this acceptation is in and for Christs perfect sati.faction; we are accepted, in the beloved, 1 Eph. in him God's will pleased; when as we are found in his righteousness, as Jacob in Esau's apparell: in Christ, not having our own righteousness, but that which is by faith, apprehending and putting on, that man is free from finne, and likewise holy, unblameable and unreprovable in Gods sight; white as snow, and whiter then the snow, compleat, perfect, perfected for ever; every way, to this end; and thence remission of finnes as before.

This is evident, because ther's as much righteousness in repaying wrongs, as in abstaining from wrongs.

I answer, it's true, and grounded on my former answer supposing a man in the righteousness of Christ.

Elle it's short: for though there be as much righteousness in repairing wrongs, as in abstaining from them. Neither are tuchient to make a man compleatly just, there must be also a doing right, a doing good.

He that trespasseth by easell, and fully satisfieth for that spoyle is done to his contentment, is as good a neighbour, and dealeth as justly and honestly with him as he that has never trespassed.

True, and yet is not so good as he should be by the Commandement, it forbiddeth evill, and requireth love and good, and from this positive part is he denominated.

No trespasser can by himselfe satistie God, he must doe it by another, putting him not only in a state of abstinence from evill, but also of righteousness, both which are done by the imputation of Christs active and passive obedience. Whence pardon.

*The essence of Justice, as in the definition of Justice is summ
cuique tribuere, to give every one that which is due to him:
ther's no more due to one injured, then that which is his own;
that is fully valuable to the injury we have done unto him.*

The former part I grant, so that there be all that's due but deny it enough, not to doe evill; good must also be done; so that Commandement. And Repentance requireth as abstinence from evill doing good; as not to bring forth evill so to bring forth good truit. *nova vita
est opima panitia*, and that by which a man abstaineth from evill, is positive goodness.

This Conclusion maketh nothing for your Faiths imputation in a proper sense. It maketh for imputation of active and passive obedience, in which ther's full compensation; giving God what's due.

Concl. 2. *There's no middle condition between a perfect
freedom from sinne, and compleat righteousness. He that is
discharged from sinne, is compleatly righteous.*

I answer, and grant that he that is discharged from sinne,

finne, is so on imputation of righteousness, that the cause is supposed, and he is compleatly righteous, and so ther's no medium.

M^r. Bradshaw's pasassage is on supposition of things, thus done and suffered joyntly; in with the rightconscience of Christ consisteth, by which a man is justified p. 75. p 22. & so p. 23. and *sands* be imputed, p. 24. and thence your named inference which is for our purpose against your felte.

Your reason, *Because nothing can any way diminish perfection of righteousness, but sinne, as degrees of darknesse, perfects of light; as the aire free from darknesse must needs be perfectly light: So he that is perfectly freed from all sinne, must needs be perfectly righteous.*

I answere, though nothing diminisheth perfection of righteousness but sinne, as degrees of darknesse doe the perfection of light; and although from the perfect freedome from darknesse, perfect light must needs be put; and he that is perfectly free from sinne, must needs be perfectly righteous.

Yet both are on suppositions, of perfect light, and perfect righteousness; which suppositions are necessary.

It's the approaching light that beginneth the dispelling of darknesse, and perfect light leaveth no darknesse at all. In sanctification flesh and spirit are contraries, then when as there is infusion of grace, and thereby corruption is mortified and dispelled; ther's fight and victory on graces part. *One contrary by overcoming death corrupts the other; and it's the highest degree of one contrary which leaveth nothing of the other.* So that though it be darkness that hindereth perfect light, it's perfect light that dispelleth all degrees of darkness.

So it's imputation of Christs perfect righteousness, which causeth compleat pardon: and though the man that's freed from all sinnes is perfectly righteous. That perfection of righteousness is not from pardon: but pardon, yea justification from imputation of Christs perfect obedience, active and passive. By this applied a

*Vnde contra-
riorum, vincen-
ti corrumpe-
re alium. Num-
mu gradus unus
cum anti ma-
teria clausus
de aliis.*

Christian is constituted righteous, and fully freed, by
effect therof.

And her's poore relief for you : for remission of sinnes
being the form of justification; in opposition to imputed
righteousnesse, for which we have the text, *By the
obedience of one man are made righteous*. None for your
Faiths proper sence.

Concl 3. Adam while he stood was compleatly just, as
just as if he had continued, to this day; as Christ from the
womb: therfore by remission to grant a man in statu quo,
Adam, before his fall, which is granted, is to grant the point
in controversy.

Adam was not so just as he had been continuing; nor
so just as the Commandement required, seeing it re-
quired also continuing on which he was to receive life.

Justice to life required, *doing this*, Gods whole Law;
wherof abstaining from the forbidden fruit, was a pledge
and experiment; on this life was promised, the contrary
threatned with death, to which Adam yielded, and in
that way looked for life, this as a tryall was the summe
of all. He was also to continue therin to that end, as the
Law openeth it, *seeing he is accursed that abideth not in all*.

Though Adam had perfection of righteousness,
ability, he was not a doer, neither did he continue, and
so had not right to life.

Though he lived by that righteousness, in which he
was created, yet not that life which was promised; that
was everlasting life: death threatned was so, and therfore
life; *what good thing shall I doe to inherit eternall life*, was a
received Doctrine, not contradicted by Christ, but
established, when as he willed him to keep the Com-
mandements, which had he done, he had not sinned, or
dyed at all.

2. I deny that Adam was as righteous as Christ from
the womb, because Christ was as righteous, and having
right to: for living comprehensive from the first mo-
ment of his conception by the Spirit and hypostacie
union, he did possesse it, as Mr. Gar. p. 28. which was
not

not true of *Adam*: therefore there was no need of his doings to life his owne; but even as our suretie, satisfying our debt; as else where.

3. For that grant that by remission of sinnes, man is in *status quo*, of *Adam* before his fall.

1. I answer. He is in a farre better and more excellent one.

2. This is a truth, supposing imputation of righteousness, by which that remission of sinnes.

3. It's false otherwile. *Adam* was just by perfect righteousness, *quoniam perfecta iustitia imbutus*, Mr. Gar. p. 28. that being inherent he was formally so. It's not thus with your justified one, by remission of sinnes. What is that righteousness? Faith? or that and other Graces? no we are not perfectly righteous that way as *Adam*; and so not in *status quo Adamus*, in the state in which *Adam* was. If God should account such an one so, it were not according to truch. It were justification by the Law which Papists teach. So they and that these are perfect; but you know it's otherwile.

Suppose now imputation of the righteousness of Christ; then that effect pardon will follow and a person is perfectly just; here's righteousness farre more excellent then *Adams* justifying, and causing pardon; and such a man may be said to be in *status quo*, with advantage.

Concl. 4. *Perfect remission of sinnes includes the imputation or acknowledgement of the observation of the whole Law; even as the imputation of the Law fulfilled necessarily includes non imputation of sinnes, or forgiveness.*

2. He that is looked upon as never offending, must needs be looked upon as one that hath kept the whole Law, which is to have a perfect righteousness, or which is the same, a perfect fulfilling of the Law imputed to him: So that besides pardon, there's no neede place for imputation of Christ's righteousness.

1. I answer, the first part is true, as we have explained before, remission, supposing the cause imputation of righteousness; imputation of righteousness being at-

tended with non imputation of sinne.

2. So we have man as never sinning.

3. And so the necessity of imputation is apparent : and that it hath a necessary place : else where's that observation of the Law included ? how else can Gods holy eyes look on a man as perfectly righteous ? the believer is not so by faith, or any other grace unless that be accepted for perfect righteousness, which yet is imperfect, which yet is no righteousness indeed; as your selfe else where. *Interpretative* must be your own speech, very improper, farre from exactnesse as after.

When as you will ~~me to compare Rom. 4.6,7. & 11.~~

We antwere, we have done it, and find imputation of the righteousness of Christ (as interpreters before) and so pardon or non imputation ; ~~by the obedience of one we are accounted righteous.~~ These we find not your interpretation. To impute righteousness and not impute sinne, are indeed different in name and nature, as cause and effect; when either is named, the other is unfolded; and by them both, is our blessed estate set forth.

Your simile of a physician by one recovering from sicknes, ~~recoverying his patient to health,~~ holdeth with Gods imputation of Christs righteousness to justification : hereby we are delivered and recovered, we are so really. It's for us. Ther's question of recovery still where Christs righteousness is denied a place, and yet man asserted perfectly righteous, and an observer of the Laws.

For that other similitude. *That act by which the sunne dispells darknesse, may be called the act by which he fills the aire with light.*

I antwere. Those acts are not the same, but differ as cause and effect : the filling of our aire with light is the cause, dispelling darkness the effect; the latter ever supposeth the former, and so doth pardon, non imputation of sinne; the imputation of the righteousness active and passive of Christ to justification, whence absolution or pardon. You say,

Forgiveness of sinnes, and imputation of righteousness, being but

but in different names, expressions, or considerations of one and the same thing, and so one and the same act of God is sometimes called forgiuenesse of sinnes, and some times an imputing of righteousnesse; and the forgiuenesse of sinnes is sometimes called an imputing of righteousness, to shew and signifie that a man needs nothing to a compleat righteousness or justification: but the forgiuenesse of his sinne: and again, the imputing of righteousness is sometimes called forgiuenesse, to shew that God hath no other righteousness to conserue upon a sinner: but that which standeth in pardon, those two termes doe but aide and assist each other.

1. Note here, that if imputation of righteousness, and forgiuenesse, be one and the same; then imputation of righteousness, cannot be denied, when as pardon is mentioned: and why are you so vehement elsewhere against imputation of righteousness? of Christ's? no other is imputed: it's shewed before.

2. Justification and righteousness are not to be confounded, it's an ordinary practise of yours, the one is the cause, the other the effect.

3. Neither are imputation of righteousness, and pardon the same, but differ also, as cause and effect: as before.

4. I deny pardon righteousness, that which formally justifyeth and have proved the same. I name another righteousness, Christ, for by *it* are we constituted righteous. Ro. 19. that's righteousness indeed. You object to your selfe:

How can God impute a righteousness that never was or had being, nor righteousness, or not of the kind of that we speake of, there being no other perfect righteousness, but that of Christ? and Answer. 1. There's as expresso and compleat a righteousness to the Law, as ever Christ performed: 2. a righteousness more proper and appropriaile to all sorts of men, then Christ's personal righteousness, which Christ himselfe performed; and what if it be said, that in remission through Christ, from and out of the Law, God imputeth to every believer such a righteousness, as is proper to him. And say it's more agreeable to Scripture and reason,

reason, then to hold an imputation of such righteousness, a scheme and frame of such actions, which were a righteousness added to him that wrote them, the Law requiring them of him : but cannot be to another, the Law requiring the same acts of none besides; for none are righteous for doing what the Law requireth simply, but for doing what it requireth of him in reference to his personal condition, calling, relations, &c.

I reply, 1. denying forgiveness of sinnes righteousness, as before, it hath no conformity to the Law which yet Christ's righteousness had, and all grant Christ's righteousness to be meere pardon.

2. It's not only his, but Gods act (if righteousness) neither performed by us, nor Christ our surety for us.

3. It's an effect of righteousness imputed (as before) or a consequent act on it imputed.

4. The Law neither requireth it, nor revealeth it, nor accepteth it, and therfore it's not expresse to the Law, no proper righteousness; it's a righteousness, and not a contradiction.

5. As for Christ's righteousness, he obeyed not for himselfe, but us, as a surety for the debtor, and so the Law requireth them of him, being once a surety; his doings and sufferings our debt.

He fullfilling all righteousness, respected and yeeldeth to every member his just proportion: of which before you have a full answer.

And when you answer further, That to say God cannot impure a righteousness which never had a being, which was never really performed by any man, is to deny that God bath power to forgive sinnes, because it's an imputation of righteousness, such as the Scripture teacheth, is without works. 4. Ro. 6. & Rom. 3. 28. i. a righteousness not consisting of any works performed to the Law by any man; and what is this, but such a righteousness as never had a being?

1. I answer. A righteousness there is never performed by any man, (as the essentiaall righteousness of God, & that of Angels) truth falls not under our consideration, and it's a righteousness indeed.

2. A righteousnesse that never had a being, implyeth a contradiction; a quality, or actions not being: and God cannot account that properly to be so that never had a being.

3. You must prove that the deniall of imputation of such a righteousnesse, as is none, is a denyall of Gods power to forgive finnes.

4. I deny forgiuenesse of finnes to be imputation of righteousnesse, it's but the effect therof.

5. Righteousnesse without works simply, is a contradiction, denyeth the definition therof. Justification without our personall works we confess, not works simply, of the Mediator suppose; and that's the Apostles meaning, as our Church and the learned; and you hold them an essentiall requisite.

Concl. 5. *He that is fully acquittred and discharged from finnes, needeth no other righteousnesse to give him a right or title to life: 2. Thereason therof is, death is the wages of sinne, and sinne only. Now he that is free from death, hath a right to life, because ther's no middle.*

1. I answere: a full discharge supposeth a full satisfaction, that's by active and passive righteousnesse, ours by imputation: whence, forgiuenesse, and right to life: so there is no farther need, nor middle, between one just and pardoned, free from sinne: you put the cause the righteousnesse of Christ imputed.

2. deny that supposition, I deny pardon, or right to life.

3. Christs death without obedience active in flowing, is insufficient to constitute him a Priest for us, or his sacrifice propitiatory, *ex concessis*: and therefore to full pardon.

4. Pardon without righteousnesse, supposed qualifieth not to life: life is the sequell, as of that, so of somewhat else, whether Christs righteousnesse and adoption, or adoption (founded in inherent righteousnesse, that birth of God, and Christs perfect obedience, which is principall) the eternall rule is, *do this and live: for which Christ*

was the end of the Law for rightousnes to believers, dying and doing, as our surety for our debt: thus is the Law established.

Adam whilst innocent had right to life, and enjoyed it, else could he not be threatened with death, 2. Gen. 17. though he had not done the Law to have right to life. If he had no right by freeome from sinne, what quantity of obedience, and how long must he have obeyed to have right to life?

It's true, Adam innocent had a naturall life, and what was connaturall also, consisting in Gods image, by which he was conformed to the Law, and so was free from sinne and death; and so had promise of continuance of those lives, and also of a glorious life: So hath the man to whom G O D giveth the righteousnes of Christ, and so pardon: what's this to him that is supposed without righteousness simply? ther's no likenes.

To your Question though I cannot, nor doe answer, it helpeth not your conclusion.

Yet I should thinke he must have all righteousness, and what is for ever: this I have, *being compleat in Christ, I have everlasting righteousness, and am in status quo.* rather a better, which no man is or can be by pardon (supposing it possible to be, which yet cannot be, seeing they are *convaria immediata*, and cause and effect.

You say, *The Scriptures of the new Testament, seeme to place the immediate right, believers have of heaven and glory, rather in adoption purchased, then in any righteousness.*

1. The life then which was promised was glory which *Adam* had not, enjoyed not, as not doing this, or fell from that, was, and is the promised life, in old and new Testament.

2. If it be rather founded in adoption, then that discharge why doe you give right by that discharge? you thwart your selfe, or else must give it to both.

1. When you say, *it is not by any righteousness,* you say it's not by remission of sinnes, or deny that to be (which yet is before asserted) righteousness.

2. And

2. And why doe the Scriptures old and new require,
doe this to life: The spirit is life saith St. Paul, because of
 righteousness, 8 Ro.10. See *Pontius* and *Chamier* of im-
 puted righteousness.

And what need you to argue our being *in statu quo*,
 from a full discharge, and to a perfect righteousness, if
 it furthers not to life?

If we be *in statu quo*, and have perfect righteousness,
 we are qualified to that life thence: so where Christ's
 righteousness is acknowledged imputed; or else to what
 end is it? and if it be not so (that is we are not *in statu quo*)
 as it is certaine, where this is denied, your arguments
 thence must be confessed sophisticall.

But you may evade by your manner of proposall, it
 seems, it may seem in your borrowed light, and not be,
quodam evidenter quae non sunt.

To which you adde, *the reason may be happily, this life,*
&c, which comes by Christ through Faith, are of an higher na-
ture than that promised Adam, as wages for worke, or obedience
to the Law, requiring a fuller and richer title, to interest the
creature then that. Worke performed intituleth sufficiently to
hire and wages: but the gift of an inheritance requirereth grace
and speciall favour as adoption, to make a man regularly and
according to the course of humaine transallion capable therof.

1. I answer. Life by Christ is eternall. 2. Eternall life
 was promised to those that *doe this*: as that question
what shall I doe to inherit eternall life? and the answer of
 Christ sheweth in the Gospel. 3. This was of an higher
 nature then that life which *Adam* had and enjoyed, but
 not then was promised. Had *Adam* done it was not
 wages or hire, because it was what he *ought*, and was
 justly punished for not performance; *when we have done*
all we are unprofitable servants, and doe but what we oughts. It's
 a favour and a mercy to make a promise of eternall life
 to a creature.

4. We have by Christ a richer title, Christ his merits,
 his active and passive obedience, doings, sufferings im-
 puted; *by his poverty we are made rich, by his obedience we*

are constituted righteous; these performed by our surety accounted to us intitle us to life; *the spirit is life because of righteousness.*

Were it by adoption it may be by righteousness, we are *heires of the righteousness of faith,* if life followeth our new birth, in which adoption is founded, which is imperfect, how much more the perfect righteousness of Christ, by which we are compleatly like unto the Lord? so that ther's no fight or opposition, but sweet agreement. When as the Apostle *faith, that precious faith is obtained through the righteousness of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ;* of Jesus Christ who is our God and Saviour, adoption or Sonne-ship the effect of Faith, must needs be an effect of righteousness; *the cause of the cause, is the cause of the effect,* and by the same reason adoption is not an higher title then the righteousness of Christ, it's founded in it. Our life was the hire and wages of Christ, our sureties obedience. Ther's as well grace and favour in the obedience of Christ, and justification, as in adoption and life: all are of free grace, justice and grace are both in Justification 3. Rom. 24. &c.

*Concl. 6. That satisfaction which Christ made to the justice of God, and thereby procured remission of sinnes (or perfect righteousness); and reconciliation with God for those that believe, consists only in that obedience of his, which he performed to that peculiar and speciall Law of mediation, which God imposed upon him, which we commonly, though perhaps not so properly call *passive obedience*, and not at all in that subjection which he exhibited to that common law of nature, which we call Morall.*

i. Remision of sinnes, and perfect righteousness are not the same, they differ in the cause and effect, as Mr. *Gars* and we before have shewed.

Reconciliation, though it infoldeth remission of sinnes, is of a larger extent then remission. It containes slaughter of enmity simple, between us and God, and positive amity, that which is perfect in regard of Christ's righteousness imputed, as well as what's inherent according to its degree.

I confess Christ's satisfaction doth consist only in that obedience of his which he performed to the Law of mediation, imposed on him by God, and that was our whole debt, which was not only death, but obedience to the Morall Law. We owe unto God perfect obedience, our surety must satisfie that; death excluding obedience was not *satis*, it's an ingredient absolutely necessary to cause death to be propitiatory or satisfactory. You call obedience to the Morall Law, the common law of nature: Nature oweth it then, it must be paid by our surety, or it's not *satis*.

The whole humiliation of Christ, beginning at his conception continued to death, consummated in death, was what was due, what was imposed, what was performed, our nature, holynesse and righteousnesse of nature and life; his whole subjection to the Law, were all due by that law of Mediation; and that was as large as our debt to the Morall Law, the fullfilling of it: deny this, ther's no fullfilling the Law of a Mediator, no satisfaction. As for Christ's obedience to the Law for his owne life, it's vaine, seeing he was perfectly living from the first moment of his conception.

Your reason, because nothing can be satisfactory for sinne to divine justice, but what's penall; without blood-shedding ther's no remission nor satisfaction.

1. I grant without blood shedding ther's no remission nor satisfaction:

2. And nothing can be satisfactory but what's penall, so was Christ's whole exinanition and obedience penall laid on him, and submitted unto as our surety, for us.

3. satisfaction for sinne is but a part, justice requireth the whole debt, and that must be and is where there is compleat satisfaction; your selfe hold that active obedience an essentiall requisite to make sufferings effectuall.

The obedience or subjection of Christ to the Morall Law was no wayes penall to him, 1. it could not be in respect of his Godhead, is not being passive, 2. not to his humane nature, because

it was required of him in innocency, imposed on Adam before his fall, and ever lyeth on man and Angels, and Iesu Christ now glorified; love the fulfilling of the Law never falleth away. To make obedience to the Morall Law penall, is to affirme man was punished by order from God, before his fall, and that the glorified Saints, Angels, and Christ, are now punished in heaven.

1. What was imposed by God before the fall and ever lyeth on man, never falleth away: the fulfilling of the Law is his debt then, by an eternall Law, and must be answere by a mans selfe or Mediator. It being impossible to man our surety must make satisfaction.

2. Subjection of Christ to the Morall Law, he being our surety, that our debt, must needs be penall to him; so was his being man, and making under the Law, Gal. 4. It was necessary for our Redemption, who were under the Law, and to our receiving the adoption of sonnes. It was his humiliation and emptying of himselfe; his being in forme of a servant, his poverty, the person was therby abased.

Neither was he bound to be Man for himselfe, or to obey for himselfe, but us, *the children* by predestination being partakers of flesh and blood, *those that were given to him from eternit to give life unto*, finning occasioned his Incarnation. &c. neither was it needfull for himselfe to obey being Man, that he might live when as he lived from the first moment of conception.

So that though it be not penall firmly, and to all it must be confessed so to Jefus Christ our surety.

Besides Christ our surety, *In vita passivam habuit alio-*
nem, & in morte passionem activam dum salutem operaretur in
medio terra, as Gerhard out of Bernard. *In passione sum-*
mo amar Dei & ardenter, erga genus humannum dilectio
patientia, obedientia, humilitas, fiducia, invocatio, spes; &
darnari patiente satis faciunt Legi si Christus patiendo: that is on-
 ly by sufferings, excluding his obedience to Gods Laws.
 His death was obedience. *Sponde enim Christus appetit pro*
nobis mortem—quia & voluntati patris etiam obediens esse, &
salutem mundi perficere summo desiderio voluit, cui voluntatis?

*au generalitatum, qua omnis creatura rationalis, sonatur? inus
comprimit singulari sibi imposita, ut vim amponentes pro omnibus
suis. Verusq; voluntatis obsequium, morte prestitum. Generalem
legem moriendo pro nobis caritate summa implevit. Nulla enim
charitas major quam dare vitam pro amicis, ne dum pro inimicis
quod fecit Christus. Charitas vera est impletio Legis, &c. See
Pareus on Rom. 5. 19. p. 372. Universa Christi vita quid fuit,
nisi perpetua quadam passio quam morte tandem consummavit
pro nobis. ib. See him after in dub. 7. Deinde in passione &c.
sedes vel iugularis totius Legis. Mosaica impletio deprehenditur,
charitate —— precepta moralia impletivit p. 399.
amplius quam nudam satisfactionem reperiemus in autem filii
Dei tanta cum aliorumate personae ib. p. 400.*

You goe on. *Scriptures ascribe not this satisfaction we speak
of nor any part or degree of it to the holinesse, innocencie, or active
obedience of Christ: but stileto his passive.*

The Scripture giveth it to Christs subjection to the Law, Gal. 4. 10 his obedience, Rom. 5. 19. obedience from the moment of his Incarnation unto his death and these are confessedly absolutely necessary to the constitution of him our Priest, and his sacrifice propitiatory, essenti-all requisites.

Places which mention his passive obedience, exclude not but include his righteousness, by a synecdoche, as Calvin and other reformed writers, of which before they may not be separated also before.

Concl. 7. *If Christ had fulfilled and kept the Law for us, i. in our stead, till the u. most period of his life, there had been no occasion or necessity of dying for us; there is no light clearer than this.*

1. Sir you say you see. 2. Both death and obedience were our debt, and are necessary to our surety.

Could a believer be supposed perfectly, personally righteous doing this, it were insufficient in himselfe, in his surety, the debt being larger, and so for death.

You lay. *If we stand before God by vertue of the perfect
obedience of Christ's life imputed unto us as our righteousness, &c.
perfectly righteous; we are no more obnoxious to the curse of the
Law,*

Law, and so have no need of satisfaction to divine justice, nor of any remission of sinnes in his blood, there needs no more to a perfect justification, than a perfect righteousness, and a perfect fulfilling of the Law.

1. If there need no more, how say you it is unnecessary? and how can you give us a perfect justification without a perfect righteousness?

Our perfect righteousness by the righteousness of Christ imputed, includeth Christ's passive obedience, they must not be nor are severed by us; death and obedience are our debt, our surety satisfied by both, and was insufficient.

This is the Apostle clearly layeth downe, Gal. 1.21. If righteousness be by the Law whether performed by our selves, or another for us, (for that's the same reason in justification) then Christ dyed in vain.

You must prove your interpretation, it's expressly against as what is said, for the Articles of *Ireland* and our Doctrine of Justification, it's true of legall righteousness personal, not by our sureties; righteousness is necessary to justification as your selfe seemed to say but now; if not our own, anothers, our suretie's, Christ's, in which St. Paul would be found, not having his owne exclude this, you put Justification without justice; justification of the unjust ther's no middle.

To your Objection of *Piscator*, I oppose his opponents Lutherans and Calvinists and to Mr. *Gataker Luccius* and *Gen. the S* triptures, your selves, who make what Christ was bound unto *lege mediatoria*, necessary, which was his whole humility from, or obedience begunne in his incarnation, continued to his death, as *Parens*. I oppose the Doctrine of *England* and *Ireland*, and am ready to examine any of your reasons; and I must tell you none of these are for faith in a proper sense: nor deny, but teach the imputation of the righteousness of Christ as *Parens*, which you doe not with Mr. *Wor. Arminius* and *Socinus*.

Concl 8. *The union and communion which true believers have*

have with Christ, doth no wise require or suppose such imputation of his righteousness to them as is conceived.

Union and communion with Christ simply doth not suppose that imputation: but union and communion with Christs righteousness to justification, there must be in order of nature giving and receiving to union and communion, and so Justification. When you adde,

I haue union and communion which the wife haue with the Husband, doth not require that whatsoeuer the husband doth should be imputed to the wife; or that the wife should be reputed to have whatsoever the husband hath; she is not reputed wise, because the husband is wise, nor honest, whiche he may have, and she be loose and fise.

I answere 1. Ther's no simile that runneth on all fourte feet. *omne simile est dissimile.*

2. It followeth not from *dissimilitude*, in husband and wife: that it is so in our union with Christ:

The Scripture saith, Christ is made unto believers of God, *wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption*. and that by union; and by his obedience we are constituted righteous: and that the members of Christ are conformed to their head: men and women may have fooles to husbands and wives, and dishonest, and be so denominated thence; Christ hath no such members.

3. Our husband is our Saviour, by way of a surety, as a surety he dyed and obeyed for us, by union wee have communion with his death, and obedience to our justification.

illa que Christi est subjectivè, tanquam aliena justificari cum ita sit aliena ut etiam tatione, pro nobis enim propriè practica & a Deo tanquam nostra ac excepta, quemadmodum fides justoris pro debito solutionem, perinde recipit creditor, ac si debitor ipse eam fecisset, & quod est proprium capit'is Christi iure communicationis relatu corpori, id est Ecclesie, & singulis membris tributum, Iustus p. 33.

You demand, whether Christ's soule and body must needs be imputed to them, because believing they have union with them, wisdom, power and glory also: so that they are esteemed of God as wise, as powerfull, as glorious as himself.

And I answer, we say not whatsoever believers need neither bodies nor soules; they are, though in state of

*Neque vero absurdum vide i
debet nos justitia fit nostra imputa
tio nostra imputatio*

condemnation; we speak of righteousness to justification. We read of *imputation of righteousness*, and that Christ's seeing by us, (we reade also) we are *constituted righteous*.

Our union is made good by these particulars. 1. That by it we are members of that body wherof he is head. 2. That we are partakers of the same spirit; have fellowship in the same fruits of the spirit with him. 4. That we have part in Redemption purchased. 5. Speciall interest in his wisdom, power, & other perfections of his person. 6. Compleat title to that immortall inheritance, reserved in the heavens. 7. Communion with God himself & communion one with another. Whence to deny the imputation of Christ's righteousness, is no more to deny or obscure the union, then to deny the miracles Christ wroughts, are imputed to us, or that to deny a man seeth with his hands, or heareth with his heeles, is a denying the members of the same body to have union with the dead.

I deny that ther's the same reason of imputation of Christ's miracles, and his righteousness, from our union with him, or of seeing with hands, or hearing with heeles, from union of members with the head, and imputation of Christ's righteousness our head in union, &c. This is but a cunning, or rather palpable puddling of a cleare streme, for your own eva[n]tion, and it's observed to be your manner. I cannot see with my hands, in your sense, nor heare with my heeles; neither need I hands to see, nor heeles to heare. I can be righteous with the righteousness of Christ. It's necessary absolutely, that I may be so perfectly.

How richly soever you be clothed else. I profess my selfe naked, and have absolute necessity of the robes of Christ's righteousness, to cover my nakednes. It's what I owe. My Saviours, my sureties: payment for my freedom in necessity. God made him righteousness to me, and I am constituted righteous by his obedience. God never made mine hands eyes to me, nor heeles eares, neither by one or other am I constituted, seeing or hearing. So miracles are not my debt.

And though the one follow not from the other; yet from

from what you grant by union and communion I question not but I shall deduce by divine or Scripture Logickie participation of righteousnesse to justification.

1. From the first, *that by union I am a member of the body, wherof Christ is the head.*

2. I am a member of Christ mine head. 2. and compleat in him, which cannot be for righteousnesse, but by his, no justifications without that, no pardon. I may beleive it, seeing his righteousness was for me: and the word is, *by us I am constituted righteous.*

3. You say, *we are partakers of the same spirit.* Then is our union reall, revera, and not metaphoricall only.

The worke of the *spirit of my God, and in the name of Christ, is washing,* that's a generall sanctification; both parts; and *justification,* the Spirit applyeth Christ and his righteousness, putteth on me the best robe, and inableth me by faith to cooperate, thereunto to apply the same.

3. *Pars in redempson, enfoldeth part in Christ's ransome or payment of my debt, my debt being death and perfect obedience, require answerable death and obedience; death is insufficient without this essentiaall requisite, I have a necessity of this righteousness then to this freedom.*

5. If *by union I have speciall interest in his wisdome and power too, and other perfections,* why not in his righteousness? It's a perfection most necessary.

6. If I *have compleat title to that immortall inheritance reserved in the heavens;* have I no title to that by which adoption and pardon? I and Christ's righteousness by which I live; by which I am perfectly like God. Is it not the righteousness of Faith, that which we are heirs of, as well as of glory?

7. If I *have communion with God himself, and his Love,* have I not it in pardon & justification, & righteousness, by which? is not giving of Christ's righteousness or imputation therof, his making me *wholly faire, white as snow, and whiter,* which is by the fairenesse and beauty, or righteousness of Christ? Is not his Covenant everlasting

sting righteousness, *Dan. 9.* and his gift Christ's righteousness, the righteousness of Faith, given by God, received by faith: doth not he by the obedience of one (becoming our God) constitute us righteous? these seeme so to me; doe you consider the matter a second time.

Concl. 9. *The sinne of Adam is nowhere in Scripture said to be imputed to Adams posterity; neither can any other imputation therof, be proved either by Scripture or reason, than that which stands either in a communion of all his posterity with him therin (except Christ) in a propagation of his nature defiled therewith, or lastly, in the punishment, that is come upon the world by it, &c.*

Do you not see how you speak that which fighteth with it selfe! If it doth nowhere, how in such a sense? if in such a sense, how nowhere?

And why shall not all the posterity be granted, constituted sinners, by an act of Justice imputing unto them the sinne of *Adam*; when as by the same justice ther's an act punishing for that sinne, such you contend and such is that defilement, whence we are formally sinners; can justice impute the effect and not the cause? is it not spirituall death for sinne?

When as all were in his loynes, it was the sinne of all which act of *Adam* passing, our selves, not existing, can no other wayes be in the judgement of the learned Protestant, and Papists too (sometimes) but by imputation, that's the manner when as it's communicated by generation.

Adam (faith Bell for Bp. *Dowham* citeth him and both give you an instance of mine assertion) alone did indeed commit that sinne by actuall will, but to us it is communicated by generation: *In this manner which is at which a passing can be imputed, by imputation, for it is imputed unto all:*

Ex modo quo communica i post- test is iudic trans- sum, nim sum per imputationem omittit enim imputatur. *for it is imputed to all who are borne of Adam, because we all being then in the loynes of Adam, when we sinned in him, and by him we sinned. Yea and further her gibly disputeth saint* *Bishop, that if Adam's sinne were not ours by imputation, neither*

nether the guilt of us, nor the corruption following upon it had belonged to us, de justi. li. 4 c. 10. vise. which I touched even now, and remember it touched twice before. I may not abuse the Reader by writing over and over the same things : See Ans. to your last Question, &c.

Concl. o. Though justification and salvation came into the world by Christ, the second Adam, as condemnation and death by the first, yet there are many different considerations and circumstances between their commings: an.

Grant this, yet when as the Apostle affirms the one and the other ; and when as he sheweth agreement in this, that *as by the disobedience of one many are made sinners, so by the obedience of one many are made righteous*, which is all we contend for, both which being by acts transient, communicated to men, not then, but after existent, the orthodox expreſſure hath been, that the manner is imputation. For the first *Adam's* disobedience, and the seconds righteousness.

The differences you mention *out of the 15. & 16. of the 8. of the Romans*, concerne not our question. And for the rest :

1. The act of *Adam* was the act of the nature of his posterity, not existent, existence was future, and imputation future, yet both to be by Gods decree, in and by propagation; and then it was theirs actually.

The obedience of Christ, &c were the acts and sufferings of us, that were given Christ, and might be so called not personall acts or we existent, but as we were to be in time; they were to be ours by imputation in Gods purpose and Christ's intention by union and communion with Christ in effectuall call: as *Adam* was a root, Christ was a surety, both in Gods purpose; either did, for others. *Adam* for his posterity, Christ for the children given unto him in Gods eternall bargaine: as we are dead and risen with Christ we may be said to have done and dyed, seeing the whole poverty was for us.

2. As *Ad.* brought condemnation to those who were in his loynes, and had a being naturall in him, being

ing in time to exist by propagation from him.

So Christ's salvation to such as were his children in the purpose of God, in that relation, as well as others *his body, bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh,* and so in his loynes, to be spiritually, actually by faith in time, though also to be first *Adams, aliens and enemies.*

3. As all the posterity of *Adam* had their being at once in *Adam*: so had all in Christ in God's purpose as *Cain* existed first, and then *Iudas* so might one first, and another after be in Christ notwithstanding.

4. As *Adam* was active, so Christ, active in his passion, and passive in his action.

5. As the burthen of condemnation by the sinne of *Adam* depended on the merit and relation of those that were condemned by him, *vsedelice*, in God's purpose, as future and to be in act by propagation.

So that weight of our redemption, depended on the merit of Christ, and relation future by God's purpose; in act by faith, to be in time, by which Christ and his merits and benefits are mine, without which actuall application the worth of what was done and suffered, were to no effect.

To that sinne of Adam, eating the forbidden fruit, the Lord threatened death, and it merited the same; so the smallest sinne doth, as the satisfaction of Christ did life; and that wee might enjoy it, there must be relation founded in union and communion between us and Christ, without which how great soever the merit, the profit to *Peter* would have been no more then unto *Iudas*.

We deny not but the Scriptures give our justification and salvation to the *take of Christ*: we assent also that speaking of our death, by one that is *Adams* sinne (though the words for his take, are not found) yet (the wages of sinne being death.) It's equivalent with his sinnes take, denoting its merit; ther's equipollent speech; and judge whether the Apostle doth not so lay them downe,

Rom. 5. 19. and ther's a necessary implication of the merit of the sinne of *Adam*; that mediated by way of merit this condemnation, *the wages of sinne is death*; and *cursed is every one that abideth not in all the Commandments of God*: And *he that doth these things is worthy of death*, are the measure of those by one, &c. and through the offence of one and were it not a meritorious cause, the Lord must be charged with injustice.

Wheras you lessening the offensivenesse of this sinne of *Adam*, put a note on that word *τεπάτημα*, as if the offensivenesse of that sinne, and heighes of his meritis were not intended: and to denote that it was a sinfull stumbling, or mis-carriage, not out of envie, malice, sinister end, &c. maine aggravations, and rayings of the heighes of it: but one of inconsideratenesse, incognancie, a root of the least baturnesse, or provocation from whence it is lightly possibele to spring.

For my part I never feared such Doctrine: And 1. from that word it will not follow (it the speaking of God in the Word be the rule) I finde that word used for finnes of all sorts, the greatest and most heinous, which are forgiven by the Lord. It's used 5. *Rom. 10. the free gift is of many offences to justification*: And 2. *Cor. 5. 19. God was in Christ, &c. not imputing τεπάτημα πατέντων, &c.* I suppose in these and other places, not meant such finnes as you mention alone, but what are of the highest nature; the stumbling and fall of the Jewes, which had aggravations of the highest nature, are set forth by that word, 1. *Rom. 11. &c.*

Whosoever shall consider the state in which *Adam* was created, the God and goodnesse against whom he sinned; the confestel effects, finnes, simply else, of nature, of life, all mens deprivation of Gods image and through deprivation in nature and life; from the reliques wherof we are not freed till death it selfe, with the deaths which attend on the same, will be farre from lessening this sin its demerit. There are that call it *omnisimum gravissimum*, and that except none but that against the Holy Ghost, as our Dr *Winkler*. So that had there been more relations,

tions all that can be imagined: there must be also and was the heynousness of the crime demeriting.

*Quod primus voca-
vatur,*

*et auctorita-
tis sum hic vo-
tar.*

*et auctorita-
tis Obedientiam*

spiritu homini.

*Sic Gravitate
eius peccati mag-
gerat, tanquam fu-
isse immunit, ut
haud mirum si
omnes suo reatu
involuerit, fodi-
tate injuriare.*

*In obedientia e-
nimi vix aliud ne-
fa, gravius datur
in Dei conspectu.
quasi peccatum a-
tri-landi est rebel-
lio et quasi scelus
idolatriæ est
repugnanciam, In-
quit samuel 1. 18.*

39.

That which is first called offence here, he caueth disobedience, so he amplifieth the greatness of that sin, intimating it so great, that it was no wonder that it involved all in its guilt, polluted them with filth: for there is scarcely a more grievous sin, as the sin of witchcraft, so is rebellion, as Idolatry, saith Samuel, 1 Sam. 11. 23.

It grieveth us not that there is such an abundance given to Christ, we glory in it. And yet say the Lord saw this a sufficient remedy for that disease, and those that came by it: and the disease is not lessened but intended by the greatness of Christs merits.

And though Adams fall was by a permissive decree of God, yet was the effect infallible. The execution whereof in his fall was supposed, in the manifestation of Gods love in Christ, and in the purpose of God foreordaining him a Lambe, to take away finnes; That sinne; and the consequences thereof: all which set forth the heynousness of this sinne. Neither is it extenuated by the freenessle of Adam.

And I leave to the Readers consideration, whether though you profess the contrary; you doe not grossly extenuate the demerit and guilt of Adams sin. And the invalidity you plead, is not against us, but the Apostle who telleth us there is an agreement.

*Conclu. 11. That which makes a true lively faith instru-
mentall in justification, is nothing that is essential or naturall unto it; Whether d. scient pr. perily or alt. But somwhat that is extrin-
sicall and purely adventitious. The force and efficacy of that will,
good pleasure, ordination, covenant, and appointment of God in
that behalfe.*

*Therefore its unquestionably evident, that Faith doth not justify
as it relates to Christ: or as it apprehends him, Or Redemp-
tion by him.*

In this illation you shew your selfe in opposition to all Protestants as before. Who teach that Faith justifieth in relation to the Object, and that as an instrument apprehending

hending and applying Christ and his righteousness, and joyned with ^{the} ~~appys~~ and ~~ministrans~~, as before.

The reason you give Gods ordination, is no reason; we grant Gods will and the nature of Faith are not opposite but subordinate. Gods will is our Justification by Faith that which hath of its nature embracing laying hold of receiving Christ and his righteousness, causing union and communion with him: from whence this righteousness and Justification is received and remission of sins. The will of God is by this Faith to justify. When God called Aaron to be an high Priest, he thereby fitted him with all requisites. And so when God ordained faith, it was such a Faith.

Neither is there fear if faith should justify by receiving or applying the Object, that it should doe it for the dignity therof.

Faith ~~is~~ receiving flying for refuge to Christ, is the greatest argument denying the dignity thereof and demonstration of indigency and emptynesse at home, and is withall most advancing and extolling the righteousness of Christ.

In that text *Judg. 6. 40.* Gods will establisheth this Faith. And thereby it carrieth Justification by receiving and applying it, as the water of *lordan* did cleanse the Leprosie of *Azarias*, by Gods pleasure, so this receiving faith justifies before all other. You say,

When causes have a naturall power to produce their effects its improper if not ridiculous. To ascribe such effects to the will and pleasure of God.

But it's ridiculous, to say so; seeing Gods will is the cause of nature, and the properties therof. It's the will of God by patience to make men patient, humility to make men humble. By naturall causes to produce naturall effects. You confess it a truth, and when as therefore you deny it the *favour or weight of truth*. You deny in your scite a right favour of truth. And shew your judgement a false ballance against concession, denying it weight of truth. *The holy Ghost leading us all truth*: sa-
vou'reth

voureth all truth, and giveth to all its due weight.

Joh. 1. 12, might be added, where God so to those that received Christ, that is believed in him, gave the power & prerogative to be his Sons: and by virtue of that decree really made them such on believing, is which shews believing in Christ as such doth not make a son of God, but receives this power by speciall gift.

Faith then by a power it receiveth of Gods gift, doth this; so doth patience by a power and humility, by a power received, make patient and humble. So fire burneth by a power given to it. And so every naturall agent produceth its effect. Faith putteth on Christ, and his condition of a Sonne, it maketh us Christ's and Abrahams seed, we are all the sonnes of God by Faith in Jesus Christ. God giveth it that power, that strength and power to receive, and so to justifie.

Gods grace and Christ and Faith and Gods justice the declaration of it are tybordinate from the position of on you put all, and deny none, not faith receiving or applying the Object. You adde,

Neither is that Pleas so frequently insisted on, that Faith justifieth in relation to the object, or as it receiveth and apprehendeth Christ rigteousnesse of any value if duly considered; the strength of it is usually bound up in that similitude, as the hand is said to intox a man because it receives the money or treasure whereby it is intished, so faith because it receives Christ who is our righteousness; and by whom we are justified.

You confess this frequently insisted on, it is so by Protestants against Papists. I have shewed the one and other by all Protestants let the world see how these are of your opinion, for faith in a proper sense; but what say you against it?

I answer its not the taking of the Silver or Gold that intisheth a man may not be the richer, but the poorer receiving gold nor by law, as a thefse breaking into an house taking it away, or purses it maketh rich by a Law; so there must be a law that faith receiving should be a mans righteousness or justification.

All this is not to the purpose, for faith receiving Christ and his righteousness to justification (not being his rightcoumable

righteousnesse or justification as you lovet to speak, not we) is what we have Gods command for, calling us to come unto him, to receive him: and Sir receiving riches is that by which as an instrumentall action I am enriched, the riches make rich received and so our Lord Christ's righteousnesse, your case is where ther s no law, ours hath command and promise for it. Yet to explaine your selfe. You desire,

When I deny faith justifieth in its relation to its Object, or as it layeth hold on Christ, I am farre from conceyving any faith should justifie, but that onely which layeth hold on Christ; yea I grant and verily believe that whereas therre be very many acts of Faith, else yet that decree of good pleasure of God (which I conceyue makes faith justifying concretely wher it is toward this great effect onely in that act of laying hold on Christ. Only this I say, that this act of faith whereby it receyveth or layeth hold on Christ hath that in the nature or intently in it or any other waies benne from the will and good pleasure of God which makes it available to justification.

This granteth that it hath it in its nature from the will of God, then by the will of God it doth it; It's nature being to lay hold on the Object: we never opposed the will of God, but suppose it.

And though you grant it, yet would you speake out we should find you grant not that faith as an instrument doth it, laying hold on Christs righteousnesse, by which applyed I am just. You will leave the object and rest in faith which by gracious acceptation is a righteousnesse which God will owne as before, p. 84. of 1. *Treat. Argu.* 5.c.6. *To my Answer.*

Conclu: 12. It hath no foundation either in scripture or reason to say that Christ by any imputation of sin was made formally a sinner: Nor that sinne in any other sense shoulde said to bee imputed then as the punishment due was inflicted on him. And so wee are not made formally righteous by any righteousnesse of Christ imputed. This hath been partly argued.

And its given in with both bands by the chiefe Masters of that way which we oppose. Doctor Downham. c. 19. p. 1. 2.

and p. 4. *Davenant de justit. inher.* c. 24. p. 33. id. p. 333.

1. I answer, formally properly taken is by sinne inherent in Christ, this you deny; so do our Doctors, so imputation of our sins doth not make Christ a sinner.

2. What is added, *nor that sinne in any other sense should be said to be imposed, when as the punishment due was inflicted;* is but begged. Ours shew an imputation of sinne, whence guilt and punishment, sinnes, were inherent in us onely. Laid on Christ by imputation as our surety, and thence his punishment.

3. When as you adde so wee are not made formally righteous by any righteousness of Christ. It's granted taking formally or inherently. It's inherent in Christ, its imputed and given us, so that it constituteth us righteous, and supplyeth the place of a forme, which externally doe and may, and so denominate; as elsewhere, out of Doctor *Davenant* is cleerly explayned. The righteousness of Christ is the matter, that applyed or imputed supplyeth the forme, constituteth *bye was made sinne that knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.* But to this sufficiently before.

When as you cite Bish. *Dowbarum* you read this his *Tenor*, and he repeateth it often times, as is knowne, that Christ was not onely *hostia*, but a sinner by imputation.

And Bish. *Davenant* deniyeth your consequence there, and else where fully explaineth himselfe in this busines, to which I remit you. p. 367. *Secondus locus*, &c. and 368.

That these were *chief Mifters of that way of imputation;* might teach you they were more learned then to contradict themselves.

They were prime Doctors in their times, maintainers of the Doctrine of our Church and all Protestants in this point of Justification, and you have never I believe, never shall find any but Papists opposing themselves to them.

In this question, which yet here you doe without making bones of it, and are but an alone man.

13. Con: *That no man is indeed a person justified in the sight of God, until he obtaineth this grace by believing.*

With this Conclusion for my part I have no contro-
versie, and therefore passe further examination of any
thing about it.

The purpose is eternall, the act is in time, on call to
Faith and fellowship with Jesus Christ, whence com-
munion with his righteousness and Justification, as I
conceive.

14. Conclu: *The sentence or curse of the Law was not pro-
perly executed on Christ in his death, but his death was a ground
or consideration unto God, whereupon to dispense with his Lawes,
and to let fall the execution or suspende the penalty or curse therin
threatened, because the curse was bent on transgressors, not inno-
centes as Christ.*

If by properly you meane for his personall finnes,
and that in that name he was no transgressor, I will
grant both. He was a sinner by the imputation of our
sins, as our surety he had them laid on him, and was accursed,
what the Law threatened, curse and death, hee endured
~~he died for us~~, and was ~~accursed~~, to the word, and on this
islueth our freedome from death; and the curse; this
I am sure God did, and intended; seeing he was ~~ordained~~
~~before the foundation of the World, a Lambe;~~ the price of our
Redemption, its called Gods will, Christ came to doe it, and
~~he was made under the law to redeem those that are under the~~
~~law, you confess it the curse of the Law, incurred by us which~~
~~our surety, ought to suffer, and your selfe say, that bee~~
~~suffered was of the same nature, and kind with those things~~
which God intended by the curse of the Law.

For the body of penalties which you deny he suffered.
I know not but its comprised in those termes accordeid,
and death. I suppose those comprise the whole sys-
tem; the word faith it was ~~an atonement~~, that it was a
sweet favour to God, that it declared God just in Justifying.

And untill I comprehend his suffering fully who
was a man of sorrow like to whose sorowes there were never
sorrowes, I will not make them lesse then Gods law.

I suppose the law was executed on him according to Gods eternall purpose as our surety, and that it was executed on him, that it might not bee executed on us: and must have been executed on him that it might not be executed on us. You say,

Neither did God require the death and sufferings of Christ as a valuable consideration, whereto to dispense with his law, so as ariseth those that believe, more (if so much in a way of satisfaction, to his justice then in wisdome; for God might with as much justice have passed by the transgression of his Law, without consideration or satisfaction.

1. Christs death was required, it was required as a valuable consideration on which there was no execution on believers. It was in satisfaction of Gods justice and wisdome. It was according to his wise will whereby Christ was ordained a Lambe, it was to declare his righteousness, that he might be just and a justifier, and both infinite. It's too curious to inquire or determine whether it were rather wisdome then Justice. It favoureth of one that would willingly deny Christs satisfaction to justice: so doth that reasoning from man, I find the same spoken out by, *Socinus de Christo servat. l. 1. c. 1.* See Sybrandus examining this. See Politus his harmonia, where Soc. and Remonstrants agree in this, that there is nos essentiaijustice in God punishing sin necessarily.

I guesse it the rather because there's a bringing in of testimony that if God had pleased he might have pardoned Adams sinne without atonement by the death of Christ, which is but a supposition and that of a will in God then undetermined, indifferent against what is evidently otherwise revealed and that to be so determined from eternity, nay of an indifferent will even after Adams fall: I am confirmed from the inference therfore it had bin no way contrary

*Nec necesse fuit,
ut Christus morte
sua justitiam det
pro nosti peccata
satisfaceret, sed
Deus absque sa-
tisfactione
Christi peccata
nobis posuit con-
donare, see Socci.*

sinneres. It could not be because Gods decree was Justification by the blood of Christ and to declare his righteousness; 3 Rom. 25.26.

And that the satisfaction of Christ is agreeable to that measure in God which wee call Justice, agreeable to and what we call see Sosius, &c. doe deny it, and that it had beene but a losse of opportunity of declaring it to the World, yet had done nothing repugnant i[n] it, and so you subscribe; no marycile you wave the curle of the Lawes execution on Christ properly in the beginning.

Its well in wisedome God could not; as if Gods wisedome and justice were at odds, and that in the Apostles Judgement, who establisched Gods declaration of justice in Justification by the blood of Christ, as if infinite wisedome was not feene in that sweet agreement, betweene the mercy and Justice of God in our Justification by Jesus Christ.

I am of opinion that God in the law required of Christ (voluntarily undertaking our suretiship) the suffering of what he suffered, and those things he suffered were the same the Law threatened, and wee should have suffered our selves in value, and importance and the kind comprised under the words death and curse. And thus for your Conclusions.



C H A P. III. DISTINCTIONS.

D I S T. 1.

Justification, 1. *active*, signifieth that act of God whereby we are justified, i.e. absolveth a believener from guilt and punishment.

Here's to be supposed his making him just by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ whence abolition is the effect thereto; you often call it just making.

It may signify also in this active signification any act of any efficient -- yea to whom may be referreable all of the former formal cause is selfe, which as so in a way proper to it may be said to justify.

Consider if the forme of justification be remission of finnes, then remission of finnes worketh justification, and so is in order of nature before it: and so remission of finnes absolveth a believener from the guilt of, and punishment due unto his finnes, and so is the cause of it selfe; the cause and the effect also.

2. *That which is passive, as the effect. The former is of God, this of man who is justified.*

D I S T. 2. Of Justice, hath these Distinctions. It signifieth,

1. *The univerall and absolute holynes and integrity of his nature, making him infinitely averse from doing any thing contrary to the rules of justice, and inclines him only to doe things agreeable therunto, 11. Ps. 7.*

2. *Sometimes the nature of God we call trinitie, or faithfullnesse.*

in keeping promise, 36. Ps. 6. He. 10. 1. Job. 1. 9.

3. That gracious disposition to his people, whereby hee is still propense to do them good, relieve, support deliver, psb. 145. 7.

4. The gracious purpose of God, for giving, saving faith in due time, 2 Pet. 1. 1.

5. Most concerning our question, by the righteousnesse of God is meant that justification, way, method, or meanes of Justification whereby God makes men righteous. 5. Ro. 21. so 1. Rom. 17. 10. Rom. 3. by righteousnesse of God is meant Justification, or way of making men righteous, which Gods wisedome hath found out.

6. Sometimes I conceive it may well betaken for Gods severity to punish, 3. Ro. 25. 26. that he might appeare a severe judge and punisher of sinne.

7. Christ sometimes seemes to be called the righteousnesse of God. 42. Ies. 21. 51. Ies. 8. because hee is the great author of that righteousnesse or Justification which God vouchsafeth to the world.

Ult. The society of those that are made righteous by GOD through Christ, are called the righteousnesse of God, 2 Cor. 5. 21.

1. I know not but Gods holines and righteousnesse are distinct attributes, nor how righteousnesse should be defined by holynesse.

1. I grant it making his nature adverse to what's contrary to rules of Justice, his will and revelation of it in his word.

Inclination to do things agreeable, your text is more, he loveth; it's what he doth with delight.

2. The second is granted for faithfullnesse, but doth it respect onely promises and not threats?

3. The 3 hath no difference from the former, for doing good and delivering his people, are his promise.

4. And so is that of giving faith his promise to Christ to Abraham, under the head of blessednesse, comming, calling, gathering, saving.

Though in that place, it seemeth more fitly to meane the righteousnesse of Christ see Bish. Downham; who to

Oo that

that purpose citeth this Text, where (saith hee) it is called the righteousness of God, and our Saviour Iesus Christ. Which is an excellent testimony to prove the deity of our Saviour like to that, 2. Tit. 13. for it is not said of God and our Saviour as noting two Persons, but to note the oneness of God and our Saviour betokening one, 2. because it is that very righteousness of God whereof the Apostle speakeith in the places now mentioned, 1 Rom. 17. 3. 21. 10. 3. 2 Cor. 5. 21.

The righteousness of that person who is God. l. 4: c. 2. p. 2.

And so you see, ther's no difference between this and the last place, nether is their meant Justification, but the righteousness of Christ the mediator the only way and meanes, by which God maketh men just; this is that the Lords widdome found out to declare his righteousness, and which is revealed in the Gospell, of those texts, see the Author and place before named.

And therefore is he called, *our right onesse*, because we are made righteous by his obedience, 5 Rom. 19, and so in that, 2 Cor. 5. ult.

For your sixt it denoteth his just will to punish sinne and punishing thereof, that place proverth it, 3. Rom. 26. 27. when Christ is set forth a propitiation in blood, to declare Gods righteousness, that he might be just and the Inffirer: by it God perfectly hates sin. Vengeance is his, and out of Justice, he will repay it, 9. Heb. 30. It's the just judgement of God, that those that doe such things are worthy of death. 1. Ro. 31. it's a righteous thing with God to render affliction to them that affl. & you, 2 Thel. 1. 6.

2. This word, applyed to men signifieth sometimes that generall frame of the heart consisting of all holy dispositions and affections in some degree in every child of God, Gen. 7. 1.

This I suppose confusion of righteousness and holynesse, which are distinct ordinarily in Scripture.

Noahs righteousness was the righteousness of faith, Christs righteousness applyed by faith, and all so in regard of a gracious disposition of a soule conforming him to Gods law and congruous motions, which are properly your second signification, 10. 4. 11. 3. 5. and 1. Job. 3. 7.

3. Your 3. dealing equally with men; is the same; giving every one what is his own according to Gods law.

4. A fourth sense : *Justification* (*in the passive sense*) is sometimes by a metonymy of the cause for the effect, expressed by the word *righteousnesse*, Galat. 2. 21. if *righteousnesse*, id est. *Justification*, so 10. Ro. 4. Christ the end of the law for *righteousnesse*, &c. *Justification*, and for ver. 5. 5. Ro. 17, & 18. by one procurement of *Justification*, 8. Rom. 4. 9. Ro. 30. 10. 10. 1. Co. 1. 30. so 5. Rom. 19. compared with 18. 21. to make righteous and to justify is the same.

Here righteousness is acknowledged the cause of justification indeed, nothing can make righteous but righteousness. They are distinct as cause and effect, and though the cause being put the effect followeth, or it's ordained to this effect; Yet its not to bee excluded, and I affirm this righteouines as that which is imputed. 4. Ro. 6, 21. so the righteouseuse of Christ, so Rom. 10. 4. Christ is the confirmation of the Law, for righteousness so justification to every one that believesth, that is, applyeth it; so expressly in, 5. Rom. 17, 18, 19. so 9. Rom. 30. It was the righteousness of Christ which is of faith, he was the Stone in which they believed, and were not ashamed: the Stone the Jewes stumbled at, of which they were ignorant, and submitted not to their righteousness of God, So was Christ, and revealed in the Gospell.

You grant here the cause for the effect, now name any other righteousness but Christs; faith is not righteousness, though relatively, and as an instrument it applyeth that righteousness and these are distinct as the Instrument and the matter with which.

Remission of sins is not that righteousness, is the effect as your selfe ponder these things.

5. Christ himselfe as the procuring cause is usually called the righteousness of men, by an Ellipsis i. the Author or procurer of Justification or righteousness Jere. 23. 6. 33. 16. so our hope our life our sanctification our redemption.

Christ by his righteousness procured our Justification, it's the meritorious cause, but not only, it's the mat-

ter, and the Application of it constituteth ours shew it against Papists as I have shewed before, and shall hereafter.

6. By a metonymy of the cause for the effect, or antecedent for consequent, as well the benefits and rewards of a man's righteousness is the 1 and 3. acceptation of the word, as the blessings and priviledges which accompany that righteousness which we have by the merits of Christ in our justification, are sometimes expressed by the terme righteousness; God will render unto man his righteousness, 33. Job. 26. 111. p. 9. 5. Gal. 5.

I confess all those benefits and priviledges infoulded, in the promise and performance of this righteousness of Christ, supposing that so in the first place: *he shall pray unto God* (that is man in affliction) the effect is, *he shall be favourable unto him*, God shall forgive him.

*Per remissionem peccatorum jam-jam pro iusto cum habens, imputata ei Christi f-
lui sui iustitia, s-
ing imputedunto him.*

Moren, in loc.

Your selfe say we have them by the merits of Christ, in our Justification, I adde imputed, made ours by Gods donation, our receiving. It's his righteousness, applied.

In the second place righteousness remaineth, not only consequents.

In the third: our hope, things hoped for are the effects of righteousness of faith. Christs righteousness applied by faith. Supposing that applied.

7. The word righteousness in some construction of words, hath no precise or proper signification, distinct from the word, with which it is joyned, but together makes a sense of one and the same thing; thus imputing righteousness. Rom. 4. 6. 11. imputing doth not signify one thing, and righteousness another, but together they signify the same act of God, which we call free justification, so that to impute righteousness but freely to justifie, and righteousness imputed free justification.

Righteousnes is one thing, imputing another, Gods application or donation of it, Justification a third; the effect

effect: of righteousness applied. By Gods imputation of Christs righteousness the believer is justified; made righteous and pardoned.

You in the fourth tense confess them cause and effect.

Ult. *The word righteousness according to the propriety of the Hebrew tongue signifieth a company of righteous ones. &c. 2 Co. 5. 21. That we (should) bee made the righteousness of God in him, &c.*

1. I confess that place of a companie; wee all believers.

2. I deny that the word Righteousness signifieth a company, for then were it not true of a single man.

And the abstract put for the Concrete, will be that we might be made a company of righteous ones, which we accept, it will be by the righteousness of Christ, for the text laith in him, not in our selves but him.

Dist. 3. Christs Righteousness is of 2 Kinds, one Divines call justitia personæ: the other justitia meriti.

The termes Active and Passive, wherein this Distinction is commonly conceived, are not altogether so proper, because in that we call Passive, Christ was in some sort active, willingly and freely submitting himself unto it.

The righteousness of his person, is that whereby hee justifieth himselfe only, his merit that whereby hee justifieth others, the former consisteth partly in the integrity of his nature partly in the obedience hee performed to the Morall Law, or that which is imposed upon all. The latter is that he performed to the peculiar law of Mediation; as his submission to death, to which hee was bound as Mediator.

1. If Christ was active in his passion by voluntary submission. Looke how you asserting the passive, deny that which is Active, and dispute against it, and exclude the imputation thereof.

They were interwoven from his incarnation to his death.

2. For your Distinction, *persona et meriti*. Let mee intreat you to make it more cleare to me, I cannot down with it as it is proposed.

*Christus in vita
passivam habuit
actionem et in
morte passioem
activam dum fac-
tem operatur
medio terra.*

I thought *Iustitia persona*, had been the righteousness of Christ God-man, and that the righteousness of his merit, had been his meritorious righteousness. Which is the righteousness of his person, of Christ God-man : and can see no difference.

Whereas you say the righteousness of his person is that whereby he justifieth himselfe onely. I answer he neither was so nor did so, for himselfe, he lived and was comprehensor from the moment of his conception, needed it not for himselfe.

Wee were bound to have that integrity and that obedience, hee as our surety was bound to yield it for us.

And doe not you give, as a concurrence, so merit to the active obedience of Christ in the matter of our justification. How then shall it not bee, *in*justissam*er** ? And how shall it be for his Justification alone I confess I understand it not. And if so be that it was for himselfe it was due, and so not meritorious , as you argue. And how shall it make Christs death to bee marveilous ? His death will be left insufficient, and wee in our finnes ; either this is true or it was for us, not for himselfe.*

As for that obedience he was bound to the law of mediation, it consisteth in his whole poverty. When as being rich he became poore; to enrich us his riches consisted in that glorious estate hee had, being in the forme of God, equall with God ; his poverty in taking our nature, the integrity of his nature in regard of divine grace and the obedience he performed by it: and sufferings simply, obedience even to the death of the crosse , were all his poverty his humiliation; when he tooke this, hee as it were emptyed himselfe, and became a servant : the excellency of that nature by unction with the holy Ghost was but poverty to his former rich estate and the Apostle saith the end was our enriching. When as you say.

Hee that maintaines that Christ was bound by the moral Law to die for the finnes of men, saith in effect if he had not died he had bin a sinner.

1. I answer, put him our surety voluntarily ing ring himself to pay our debt, this being our debt, I question not but hee was bound to it. You see a surety is bound for that debt, and must to prison if he pay; not the surety, not paying transgresseth the law therein.

Pareus maketh Christ's death obedience to the Lawe, Bish. Davenant in that place. *If the righteousness of Christ satisfying bee made ours by imputation; why not also the righteousness of Christ fulfilling the law?* How well he and B. Downham and *Pareus* agree with you the world knoweth and I have in part manifested.

Si justitia Christi
satisfaciens, no-
stra fuit per im-
putationem cur-
non etiam justitia
Christi legem im-
pletans.

D I S T . 4. A thing may be said to be Imputed.

1. *A Mans owne acts good or evill, when as bee with-
out reward or punishment is reputed the doer of them so Christ's
Active and Passive obedience, to Christ, and finnes of believers
o themselves vnd no others.*

1. This is confessed not used in the Scriptures.

2. If this be so Christ did not obey for himselfe, his
ife, which is your doctrine, nor suffer for glory your
doctrine before or Gods imputation is not without ble-
nush: seeing doings are not without reward, nor suffe-
ring without a returne.

3. It crofleth the Scripture which layeth his poverty
own to make us rich. 4 Sins of believers are not so impu-
ted unto them. seeing some kind of punishments, chas-
isements follow in all whom God doth receive seeing
they are imputed to Christ who satisfieth for them.

These at first sight seem to be against this Distinction.

2 *Doings good or evill may bee said to bee imputed to him
when he is actually rewarded or punished for them; or shall be in
time, unless some reasonable and just occasion shall intervene to
alter either of these purposes concerning him.*

Let this goe, yet alteration in Gods purpose, is an
arsh expreſſion: alteration in ſuch as are good may
be ſuppoſed, and ſo ſuch as are evill but not in Gods
purpose.

3. *An other mans offence may bee imputed to us, when
we are looked on as Councillors, &c, or are punished as ac-*

cessary and so good, when we are conceived authors, teachers, Time and both justly or unjustly as wee are not counsellors, &c.

4. Luther referrre your fourth upon mistake.

5. Wickednesse or vertue of one, may be said to be imputed to others, when they are either punished or rewarded, because of relation to that man. — In this fense (and in this onely) the sinnes of men may bee imputed to Christ, because hee suffered the things he did suffer in consideration of them, and these sufferings to us because we are justified in consideration of them. But that ours are reputed to him because hee is reputed to have committed them, or that his righteousness Active or Passive, shoulde therefore said to be imputed to us, because we are reputed by God to have done or suffered one or other, hath neither footing nor foundation in the Scripture or reason.

1. Virtue in one may be imputed to another in a bare relation, an other may fare the better out of grace and bountie.

2. A bare relation is not enough for a just imputation of evill.

3. Our relation to Christ is not a bare one. he is one head, husband, Saviour, Redeemer, surely voluntarilie, interposing himselfe between us and God, undertaking our debt, satisfaction of God, our actuall justification and salvation, the Lord graciously and righteously well pleased with the same.

4. Our surety bare not only our sorrowes but our sins and was a sinner, not by committing them, (or inherently) but by imputation. there must be the imputation of sin, else not of punishment: And both justly seeing he was in this relation of a surety, and in bonds to God for us, God made him sinner who knew none, in this fense laid on him the iniquity of us all. Luther calleth him the greatest sinner.

And so his righteousness active and passive are imputed to us, by which we are made just and acquitted. They are subjectively in him, but by Gods gift or imputation to ours, as if our selves, had satisfied. *We are found having his righteousness, made righteous, made the righteousness of God in him, as we are said to satisfie when our surety doth*

it to here. So that now we may be called full fillers of the Law, with our homile.

This is a Colewort often sodden, a Papists device manifested to be so out of their Authors discovered and defeated by ours before.

6. That may be said to be imputed to a man which essentially and directly conduceth either to the benefit or punishment which accrueth to him from that, which is more properly and immediately imputed to him, when the good deeds and vertue or evill deeds, and the corruption whence are, imputed suppose to wife and Children.

In this sense as well the habituall righteousnesse of Christ's person as active obedience may be said to be imputed to believers, because these were directly and essentially requisite to make his death and sufferings Justification and life, and salvation to them. — 2. Because its remote and unusuall, and hath no manner of countenance from the Scripture. Piscator, Paræus, and other Orthodox Divines have simply denied all imputation of the Active obedience of Christ, and the doctrine of justification would not at all suffer if the expression were laid aside.

For your doublets and those Divines practise. Two or three have many thousands against them and you, who shew the contrary; I have read Piscator recanted.

For *Paræus* when as hee putteth Christ's humiliation from his incarnation to his death, that which is imputed, cannot exclude the Active obedience of Christ, indeed his passion was active. But I argue whatsoever indirectly and effentially, requisite to make the death of Christ Justification, and life and salvation. That hath countenance in the *Scriptures*, those divines cannot reasonably deny. And if it were laid aside, would cause the doctrine of Justification to suffer; destroy the very essence of it, nay Christ's death.

But both the habituall righteousness of Christ's person as well as his *active* obedience are essentially & directly requisite &c. as hath beene further opened. Ergo,

That which is effentially, is not *causa fine qua non*, *sed causa fine qua non*, is called, *causa frivola & occiosa*, because it is only present

present in the action and doth nothing therein: Doctor Abbot against Bish. p. 497. It's absolutely necessary and eternally. Its the matter or forme or both.

7. A thing may be said to be imputed to a man when as he is dealt with as if he had noth, but comes to have right in the priviledges some other way. Righteousnes is saide to be imputed, to him that believeth. 4. Rom. 5. 11. &c. by enioyng priviledges promised to a perfect righteousnes of the law, though he were be none such found in him: because Christ by his death hath purchased such a right to those priviledges, which is settled on him on believning; So that God looks on him with the same grace and favour wherewith he would looke upon him legally righteous, never sinning.

I take what you lay down, that a believer by believing in Christ, is looked on with the same grace and favour wherewith God would looke on one never sinning legally righteous? That ther's no such righteousness in him. That its,

1. Purchased by Christs death. O but deny that all, that's meant by imputation of righteousness, Roma. 4. 6, 11.

2. That death hath active obedience an essentiaall requisite ex concessione; and I affirme, that the right and priviledges may bee settled on us beleevers: there must bee an imputation of the righteousness of Christ, as the cause; Of that right and priviledges. I am found in Christs righteousness, to God looketh on mee as never sinning, as legally righteous. I am by this imputation constituted righteous and so dealt with: the imputation of passive righteousness is graunted by Piscator and others to avoid Socinianisme; and that which is Active is not to be excluded, if it be an essentiaall requisite to his death, that we may be justified by it.

8. One thing may be said to be imputed to a man for another, when the rights of one are confesed on the performance of the other. Or when on one offence that is charged with the guilt of another, the guilt and consequence whereof are more notorious. Thus hee that provided for his man dyngeth the Earth.

i. The Gospel, imparted unto him, because the evill conseq[ue]nt
of his sinnes are much the same. But are more readily ac-
knowledged, so as to frome the latter: so faith is said to be impu-
ted for righteousness, 4 R[om] 3. 5. &c. Because the same pri-
viledges, which originally did belong unto legal righteousness, are
conferred on believing.

ii. I have need of comment upon your comment and
Text two, my braines are very muddy, you bee muddle
what should give cleerenesse, to what you intend.

But I answere, faith is said to be imputed for righte-
ousnesse in a figurative sense, taking in the object the
righteousnesse of Jesus Christ, as at large before: And
therefore is a man by faith as one legally righteous, in a
more excellent estate, and hence the priviledges, From
Faith as an Instrument applying that righteousness
which God imputed: From which properly those pri-
viledges, belong and come unto us.

iii. Matter of profit concerning to a man by way of debt or do-
nation, may be said to be imputed to him: now R[om] 4. 4. the
reward, vizi of Justification and life, is said to be reckoned or
imputed to him that worketh, and so deseruesth: If God should
reward man with life upon obedience to the law: such a reward
should not be looked on as matter of grace but debt.

iv. The Apostles plaine words to him that worketh is t[he]
reward, not reckoned of grace, but of debt, so wee looke for
nothing but by Gods free grace through the righteousnesse
of Jesus Christ, imputed to us by God, received by
Faith.

This word you say is incumbred with variety of ac-
ceptations, never more thanke your selfe to my remem-
brance I never read it so much accumulated elsewhere in
any mans writing, (as that Fish) you bee muddle cleare
water. It sheweth to me you would faine escape undis-
covered in this muddle and blind eyes, that they may
not see your error.

I now come to the 5. Distinction: Obedience to the
Morall Law, may be said to be required.

2. By way of Justification has a more wiser may be performed
perfectly

perfectly righteous by God and have all the privileges.

2. By way of sanctification, that he may witness his express subjection to God in both respects, it was required of man in his innocency, and Angels still: and of Christ himself, compare Mat. 3. 16. with Jo. 15. 10.

Since the fall is not required by way of Justification in the sense expressed but only in the way of sanctification; 3. Because a sinner is not capable of such obedience. 2. Because Gods other way is faith in Christ.

Therefore to affirm the fulfilling of the Law is required of any man either by himselfe or another in his stead; For Justification is to affirm, that a man that hath sinned, hath not sinned, or that which God hath said he hath unsaid.

Obedience to the Morall Law, required of Adam was nothing else but his express subjection to God, and pleasing him in all things, this was perfect righteousness; to which performed life was promised so to Angels.

Her's an other reason of Christ, of whose poverty this was a part, he became a man, submitted to the Law for us, became poore for us, and not for himselfe.

Thus Mat. 3. 15. It became him to fullfill all righteousness; as a surety borne to us, given to us, and I thinke that particular his baptism, is numbred amongst his me diatory acts by the fautors of that distinction: to me it seemeth ther's a sameness of reason of that particular and all righteousness, all beseeched him as the Mediator and as our surety. And what was due by us, was Gods commandement to Christ and on him as our surety. Since the fall we cannot subject our selves to the Law that we may be thereby just before God, neither is subjection by sanctification, the onely way that is required.

Perfect obedience is still required to life, though we are not able; and it's impossible it's due and in force on our surety. I have read the morall law to be, *lex aeterna, et aeternae obligationis, and of eternall obligation.* Treat. 1. p. 67.

That then we may have life, either it must be answered by our selves or another, that other I affir to be our

Surely Christ, who as he died for my Justification, obeyed the Law for believers in Jesus Christ; remember that essential to his death that we may live. By Gods imputation of the perfect obedience of Christ to Gods Law; we are righteous not as by sanctification, but perfectly, and wee enjoy it by Gods other way, faith in Christ as you speake.

To affirme that the fulfilling of the law, is required of any man, or an other in his stead for Justification. Neither affirmeth that a man that hath sinned hath not sin'd, nor yet that God hath unsaid what he hath said.

Gospell righteousness is the fulfilling of the law, performed, not by us but another imputed to us.

Even Gospell righteousness is the fulfilling of the Law; neither doth it fight with the Law, for the Law is not abolished by the Gospell, but established.

D I S T . 6. Christ may bee said to keepe the law in reference to our justification 2. w i s e . 1. for us . 2. in our stead; in the former sense it's aduised not in the latter. The former supposeth onely it had an influence into our Justification, and did contribute that which was of absolute necessity therunto. The latter importeth that the keeping of the Law was primarily required of every man for his Justification, since the fall: And that God (man being unable) sent Christ to perform it in their rooms; which supposition stands convicted of manifest absurditie, in the former distinction, and elsewhere.

See the former Distinction, and the place and you shall see it cleared: It's indeed opposition to the Apostle almost in termes, Ro. 8. 3. 4. as hath been also shewed, and shall bewhen I come to that Scripture afterwards.

D I S T . 7. Justification of a sinner, & means Passus, though it bee the same entire effect may be ascribed to many causes very different.

This if it be a distinction, we subscribe to; and think it against your selfe, when as you establishing the ordination of God that Faith shall justifie, deny faiths doing it as receiving in that name, wee have observed both to have their place and yeild it of all the rest of the causes.

*Evangelica iustitia est impletio
legis non a nobis
sed ab alio pro
nobis praevisa
nobis autem adeo
per fidem imp-
tata, as Paul, 1. Th.
Casse, p. 148.*

*Etiam evangelica
iustitia est legis
impletio, ne que
pugnat cum lego
pro evangelicam
enim lex non
abolitur sed se-
tatur, id. ib.*

C H A P T . I V .
Containing EXAMINATION OF
a Deliberation of Justification in the Causes
of it: According to the Conclusions and
Distinctions laid downe.



Shall be very briefe in Examination. Your scope is to discover the weakenesse of arguments, brought against your Conclusion; that is, that *saint in a proper sense* is imputed for *righteousnesse* and not the *obedience of Christ*. I passe what hath not this scope. I suppose I do enough to our purpose. You promise rules.

Rule. 1. There are 4. causes to which every being is to be reduced.

1. This I grant, though there are who referre all to 2. & some 3. and some 5..

2. And your second, I grant.

3. Ile deauurre on the the third, till I come to application; your selfe lay in an improper sententher'some exception; and I know not that causes are not improper as well as proper.

P. 69. Prog. Causes are either remote or near. The personal holynesse and active obedience of Christ to the Law, was officious remote cause, qualifying him for such suffering; whereby justification was prossed, but had no immediate influence thereon.

Sir, I think it as noere as the sufferings of Christ, seeing its *essentially requisite*, to make his death and suffering

to effect Justification, as your selfe : which will appeare if we prove it part of the matter, and that it's applyed in the forme thereof.

Pag. 73. You make our subject the matter of an accident, and that is such no other but the subject or object, and wch is noted as concerning a speciall vaine of the question.

In your application you say: Pag. 77. God is the efficient of Justification and no other kind. But whether is hee not the finall cause? Doth hee it not for himselfe? The glory of his wisedome, mercy, Justice? it so hee is efficient and finall.

When you speake here of God, out of authority, and power, and mercy justifying; you name not Justice, yet the Apostle joyneth that with grace, 3. Rom. 15 &c.

So Christ is the impulsive morall externall cause, his death, 4 Ephesians. 3. Rom. 24. Neither can the death of Christ with any shew of reason, or with any colourable construction of any way of speaking, be referred to any other cause, but the impulsive onely. — And it's yet more repugnant to reason, it is to make Christ himselfe, or any righteousness of his whatsoever, the matter or materiall cause of Justification: as the Socinian discoverre; Pa. 139. or the forme. But it's a streine of unreasonableness above all the rest, to make them the materiall and formall cause too.

Now to these in Order.

Againe, I grant Christ a Morall, externall, impulsive cause; a meritorious cause of his death; yet his Active obedience may not be excluded. To this kind of cause, say you, Pa. 81. must be reduced the active or personall righteousness of Christ: And whenas you adde, though it be not satisfactory simply and directly in it selfe, nor contributing anything immediately by way of merit to Justification. How can it be truth seeing of that Active obedience. You said but now, that: *that these were directly and essentially requisite to make his death and sufferings Justification and selfe Sufferings* cannot exclude his Active obedience, being directly and essentially requisite, to that end. And also seeing it qualibet in pars our sacrifice of Christ, for that sufficeth and beareth

* Causa adjuvans
quia imperat, effi-
cacia principalis
quia una cum pa-
tio justificat.

of acceſſion with God, of which offer what's eſſentiall
will not be put a far off from ſufferings when they pro-
duce this effect.

* Parac on V. f.

new Catec. p. 355.

he ſaint, ſatisfac-

Christi eſt

cauſa materialis

justitiae noſtrae

And the learned

few thin on the

margent. When

he had ſaid obſer-

vandum ergo, nos

modum ſeniori diciti

nos grata Dei et

merito Chriſ-

ti — justifica-

ti; prima intelligi-

tur de cauſa no-

puliva in Deo

la unda de cauſa

materiali; nonna-

we are ſaid to be

justified by them-

es of Chriſt, i.e. ſed,

a Prince and Saviour to give remiſſion of ſinnes;

we are an

meant of the ma-

teriall cauſe, and

then merito

Chriſti iuſtifica-

mar partim ut

cauſa materiali

iuſtificationis qua-

tenus obedientia

Chriſti nobis ap-

plicata a placemus

Deo, et ea quali

Justificamus d abas rebus ſed diuerſimē dide

ut instrumenta apprehendente iuſtitudi; merito

Chriſti ut cauſa materiali noſtra iuſtifie pag. 349.

Ego docendi cauſa mate iam appellabo, de juitate pag. 173 his materia juitatis eft quad u-

plexi illa Chriſti iuſtitia, alij. 3. poſterioroſe iuſticias Chriſti, materiali, &c. Itamnunt. Tertij do-

tantum iuſticias Chriſlli poſterioroſe materiali faciunt; pag. 174, 300 ſor himſelf and all agroſ in the

by his judgement.

Mr. Perkins ſee Mr. W. defence. p. 210. See Cofſac. Thes. 11. draft p. 63: Calvins. l. 3. inſi-

c. 1. p. 17. and in Rom. 3. 21. and c. 3. 24 ſo Tricaricus p. 80. Bucanuſ ad c. 1. p. 319. Chamier de

juitif. c. 1. l. 22. p. 5. Iouan Thes. 10 auguſt. ſee Doctor Downham l. 1. c. 3. p. 3. Doctor Pridemo

de juitif. p. 156. Mr. Forb, nothing ſaint has, in heaven or in earth; in man, or without man, is the

matter of mans righteousness before God, except onely Chriſt. c. 22. p. 85. &c. The ſaint is a the matter

may be againſt your third rule in part.

You ſay Chriſt dying righteous, and being God, his death
holds our weight and worth, merit and ſatisfaction for the whole
World, Pag. 203. and call it the qualification in part, for that
meritoriousneſſe of his death; which may ſtand the whole World
inſtead for their iuſtification, Pag. 204.

When as his blood is mentioned, his obedience is not
excluded by which we are righteous. 5. Rom. 1. 9.

And when as you urge those words for his ſake, Eph. 4.
though there be truth in them as applyed yet the words
are in xpicio as God hath beene gracious unto you in Chriſt.

Obj: But cannot be referred to any kind of cauſe elſe, but
the impulsive only.

1. Chriſt is not onely the impulsive efficient, but
principall, Paracalleth him, * an adjuvant cauſe, because
be obſtructib, and efficient principall because together with the
Father he iuſtifieth.

The Sonne of Man hath power to forgive ſinnes, he is exal-
ted, a Prince and Saviour to give remiſſion of ſinnes; we are
meant of the materiall cauſe, and iuſtified in the name of Chriſt, by the ſpirit of our God.

Objc. It's a great fault that Mr. Walker maketh Chriſt
or any righteousness of his, the matter or materiall cauſe of our
Iuſtification.

Mr. Walker was not the firſt by many that ſpeake and
write ſo.

elle indui projufi repetauerit partim ut cauſa impulſiva preſeruando et merito-
ria, quatenus p opter can nos abſolvit; he ſaint nihil preter meritorum Chriſti ei juitis noſtra ſecundum de-

Justificamus d abas rebus ſed diuerſimē dide ut instrumenta apprehendente iuſtitudi; merito

Chriſti ut cauſa materiali noſtra iuſtifie pag. 349.

Ego docendi cauſa mate iam appellabo, de juitate pag. 173 his materia juitatis eft quad u-

plexi illa Chriſti iuſtitia, alij. 3. poſterioroſe iuſticias Chriſti, materiali, &c. Itamnunt. Tertij do-

tantum iuſticias Chriſlli poſterioroſe materiali faciunt; pag. 174, 300 ſor himſelf and all agroſ in the

by his judgement.

Mr. Perkins ſee Mr. W. defence. p. 210. See Cofſac. Thes. 11. draft p. 63: Calvins. l. 3. inſi-

c. 1. p. 17. and in Rom. 3. 21. and c. 3. 24 ſo Tricaricus p. 80. Bucanuſ ad c. 1. p. 319. Chamier de

juitif. c. 1. l. 22. p. 5. Iouan Thes. 10 auguſt. ſee Doctor Downham l. 1. c. 3. p. 3. Doctor Pridemo

de juitif. p. 156. Mr. Forb, nothing ſaint has, in heaven or in earth; in man, or without man, is the

matter of mans righteousness before God, except onely Chriſt. c. 22. p. 85. &c. The ſaint is a the matter

may be againſt your third rule in part.

Now

Now let us heare your argument, against this.

Pag. 85. 1. By making ~~she~~ the materiall cause of Justification they devest and spoile them of the honour of causality, which is proper unto them, and seventimes more honourable then that which is this way attributed to them, vid. of that causality we call meritorious.

1. Then they are both meritorious which you seeme to deny, p. 81.

2. Did we deny it meritorious, your argument might be to some purpote. It's requisite, that the essentiall causes of our Justification, should have worth in them, and be meritorious.

But this cannot be, say you, by our third Rule. That no one cause whatsoever can put on more habitudes, or causality then one, in respect of the same effect: So that if Christ be the meritorious and impulsive cause, which is granted on all hands, even by the men against whom I reason, it cannot be deemed the materiall cause also.

1. Your Rule is false as by that instance of God, who is the efficient and finall cause. Himselue doth all for himselfe, the last end, of him, and through him, and to him are all things, to whom be glory for ever, Amen, 11. Rom. 31. Gods selte is the end which moveth himselfe, the effici-ent, to worke.

The Logician calleth, this a most cleere Axiom, the last end and the first efficient is altogether the samething; or that God is proper speech doth nothing for an end diverse from himselfe.

2. Your Rule is false in the judgment of all those who give Christ the meritorious cause, and the materiall, as I have proved.

3. Yea I pray you consider whether Christ bee not a finall cause also, whether he had not respect to the glory of himselfe as mediator? Was it not Gods covenant with him, on his execution of Office? 55. Ies. 5. *I was he having glorified God on earth, and finished the works he gave him to doe, prayes for 27. Joh. 5. and now O father glorifie thou me with thine owne selfe, with the glory which I had with thee,*

*Præclarum ax.
ioma, res omnino
eadem est ultimum finis, et
prima causa effi-
cientia, scilicet deum
per proprie loquenda
nihil agere propon-
ter haec a iis di-
versum. Keth. 102.
de jure.*

before the world man, it's not essentiaill glory, but what God covenanted to give him on finishing the worke of mans redemption, and the Saints have given it to him. 1 Tim. 6. 14,15,16, and 1 Th. 25. and what was that high exaltation of Christ to the *Philippians*, but the glory of his mediator-ship?

Who knoweth not but man believing is an efficient? You also call him the matter of *Justification*, and you make the great subordinate end which lieth fairest and fullest in view to the sight of all men, the advancement of persons justified to that exceeding heighth of glory, &c. p. 84. and faith is an instrument and impulsive cause, true as you. p. 83.

2. You argue, The righteousness of Christ Active or Passive or both, cannot bee the matter of *Justification*, because the matter of a being is alwayes *ens incompletum*, until the introduction and union of the form with it which gives perfection and being and existence to it, but Christ's righteousness hath a perfect being neither can it fall under imagination: what form is should be capable of that by union with it, should addo beauty and perfection to it.

The righteousness of Christ how perfect soever in it selfe, yet hath the nature of *ens incompletum*, where and so long as it is matter not applyed by Gods imputation, &c the faish of such as do believe as the *nature of man*, though compounded of Elements, is *incompletum*, in regard of that effect man, before information.

Application of the righteousness of Jesus Christ instead of a forme compleateth not the matter, but the *Justification* of a believer.

And yet then hath it & insomuch (as it were) its desire, it's appetite to it, and acquiescence inoying it, as being intended by God and Christ to that worke believers *Justification*, and other end, as wee say of naturall matter.

3. If it bee the matter either properly or improperly so called; Master properly so called it cannot be, which they call materia ex qua: because this kind of master, 1. Is proper to substance

all natures, onely is *it selfe aliamis a substance*, is alwaies a part of the nature and the weaker part of it : Whereas *Justification* hath onely an accidentall being, nor substantiall, &c. nor in the predicament of *Substantia*: 3. It cannot be a part of *justification*, it being an action, this a forme or quality : and one predication is all being, cannot be of the nature of another : Lastly being of that infinite perfection and worth it cannot be the weaker and leſſe worthy part.

I Answer : Matter, properly so called, we cannot affirme it to be, nor yet do : whence the labour you take here is lost : When you say matter is proper to substantiall natures, you seeme to speake of all substantiall natures, and so to belong to formes, and they shall be materiall.

When as you say *it cannot be the matter of justification, is being an action, that a quality* : You cannot but remember that accidents simplicy are reduced to quantity and quality, and justification being a just making, as there must be somewhat that hath proportion to matter *ex qua*, so Christ's righteousness consisteth of actions, and his passions were active as before, so that ther's good analogy ; but I might passe this.

2. *That it cannot be matter improperly called, may be demonstrated, for that it is either in qua or circa quam : the subject or object. The righteousness of Christ can be neither of these.*

There is a third thats neither subject nor object. Your selfe in your explanation of this cause prove a third, *the whitenesse in the wall*. It's enough there be some kinds of analogy to matter properly so called in accidents. As your selfe speake to the whitening of a wall, there must be some matter ; this I call the colour in chalke or lime the subject ; this is the matter the Plaisterer useth to white the wall, the chalk-stone or lime in which the colour is not that that whiteth, but *qua* whitenesse adhereth. her's analogy ; So when as the Lord maketh just and righteous, he doth it with the righteousness

of Christ ; as the wall is made white with that colour, so a believer righteous with righteousness ; and in this I see the judgement of almost all Divines concurring, as before. And thus I passe to what you say it must be.

It must be either the subject or object of Justification, God or man : the former is unwork ; it must be then subjectum recipiens, or objectum, and then that, I believe ther's no other matter.

But Sir, if man believing be the matter, either *qua* man, or believing? not *qua* man, a substance cannot be the matter of an accident or action : if *qua* believing faith's an instrument, and so an efficient, and by your third Rule cannot be the matter. And though our subject and object are termed matter, yet the Logician telleteth you, that it's confusion of thole which matter and abuse : who therefore handleth them distinctly.

Before I passe to the forme, I'll consider what's said to the instruments.

P. 12. Here you confess, *faith by the uniforme Doctrine of Reformed Authors, is an instrumentall efficient.*

Of this we have spoken ; Divines make it an instrument, and give the effect to it, because of that of which it is an instrument, the righteousness of Christ to all. *Musculus* and *Aretius*, as is shewed. The impulsive is Christ's righteousness, which is not of the same kinde with faith, and ther's the same reason of other places, where deliverance is given because they believed, which was but a flying for refuge to God in Christ, and laying hold by faith as an instrument, that which hath the promise.

How Sacraments should become instrumentall causes or means of Justification, must be knowne by inquiring at the Oracle at Rome for neither the Scriptures nor the Reformed Religion have any of this learning in them.

Sacraments are visible words, and their office is to signe and seale to believers, the whole Covenant in the blood of Christ. The Apostle calleth *Circumcisio*, the signe

Abutimur no-
mine materie
cum illud tribui-
mus subjecto
et objecto,
ipse Malanthon
faith, that Logi-
cian Keckerman:
de Materia.

signe and seale of the righteousness of Faith, q 4 Rom. 11. by which justification and pardon: and when as the Supper of our Lord is the New Testament that is a signe and seale of the New Testament in the blood of Christ shed for remission of finnes.

I question not but they are powerfull instruments for confirmation of our faith, of Justification and pardon of finnes; and I remember not that I have read the contrary, otherwise I hold them not causes instrumentall.

See Dr. Prid. &c
just. p. 156.

And now for the formall cause:

And here passing the Pontifician opinion which maketh it to consist in Faith, Hope and Charity, come we to your conceit of the opinion of the Socinian discoverer, Mr. Walker, which is,

p. 139.

Not better but rather as far deeper defiance both with reason and truth. Whats the matter?

Doubtlesse her's too much matter to make a good forme.

But if all be rightly taken, there's what doth it. Justification is by the communion and imputation reciprocall of our finnes to Christ and his righteousness to us: that which followeth sheweth how it's effected by the Spirit dwelling in us working faith; this reciprocall imputation and communion is the formall cause of our Justification.

By this the matter is applyed, we are made perfectly righteous, and freed from our finnes. Against this you object:

If the forme stands in that communion betweene me and Christ, then Christ is justified with the same Justification.

Had you put in and reciprocall imputation of our finnes to Christ and his righteousness to me, you would have perceived, whats communicated on either side.

And you know we all hold we are justified formally (that is, as it were by a forme there being a kind of analogy) by the same righteousness with which Christ is justified, though not *Fodam modo*, which you must destroy before you get the mastery.

2. That communion is not righteousness directly or indirectly, conforming to the Laws equivalently or insinuatively, and therefore:

The righteousness of Christ is the matter communion and imputation thereof with him, is ever the forme, not communion but communication, imputation, application of righteousness; you mistake him.

3. The formall cause must needs be the impression of the effect of the act of Justification, the effect of God, as himselfe, p. 137. Whereas communion ariseth from the Holy Ghost, and therefore it is impossible that this communion should be the cause formall of Justification.

The effect of Gods act justifying is justification, how that shal be the formall cause of it selfe, I cannot yet conceive.

Let it be granted an act of God, yet its by the communion of the Spirit in that place, as if we were not justified by the Spirit of our God, or the Spirit were not God, as if God did not justifie us by calling us to fellowship with his Sonne; so we partake of his righteousness and justification, and God calleth and causeth that union and communion by the Spirit, and mutuall imputation.

4. This communion betweene us and Christ, is a consequent of our justification, and takeith not place, nor hath being till after we be fully and compleatly justified; this he teacheth when he wriseth it ariseth from communion with the Spirit, which is (upon believing, and consequently after our Justification, for Justification followeth faith closely, as imagination it selfe can imagine, its evident from 7 Ju. 39. &c 15. Acts 8. 2 Acts 28. &c 6 Acts 5. Acts 8. 15. 16. Acts 11. 17. with 15 Acts 19. so that union followeth, and can not be the formall cause.

5. When you speake of a full and compleate Justification, you intimate an incomplete one, and degrees, justification hath none but is *[minus individual & final summa]* as Divines speake, and thereby difference it from sanctification.

2. Its

An individuall
act and Whole
together.

*. It is a most unsound position and unworthy a Divine, which maketh communion a consequent, and after justification, for by fellowship with Christ we have fellowship with his death and resurrection, and so sanctification and justification; *In whom we have redemption, remission of sins*, 1 Col: 1 Eph: (all is to the fellowship of God's Sonne, in whom we partake of righteousness and redemption).

When Mr. Walker saith, it ariseth from fellowship or communion by the Spirit, he saith, that communion by the Spirit is before it, its rise is from thence.

Grant the Spirit shed abroade in believings (which yet in order of nature is first causing believings, God by the Spirit calleth to faith whereby we receive Christ, and have union and communion with him, by both these we are one with Christ and have communion) it followeth not that its after justification, but before to union and communion, and so justification, and though justification followeth faith closely, yet its faith in Christ uniting and causing communion with him, from whence also sanctification ariseth, which in order of nature is before justification, qualifying Faith, and conditioning the person to the same.

That believers shall and do receive the Spirit, maketh not for you, for the Spirit received justifieth, *but you are washed, but you are sanctified, but you are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God*: 1 Cor. 6. 11. God doth it by his Spirit, Acts 15. 8, 9. God giving the Holy Ghost to the Gentiles as well as the Jewes, putteth no difference betweene us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. God by the Holy Ghost purified their hearts by faith, in regard of sanctification and justification.

Acts 2. 39. *they must believe and repente and be Baptized for remission of sins*, when its said, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost: the meaning is, that extraordinary gift which they heard and saw at that time in others, which all believers have not; and I intreat you to tell me

See Act. 8. 15, me whether believing and repentance are not the gifts 16. & 19. 2. of the Holy Ghost given such by the Lord : Act. 6. 5. & 11. 15. both are coupled, Faith and the Holy Ghost, and hee giveth the Holy Ghost to believers, Act. 11. 15. but wha's that to prove the giving of the Holy Ghost after justification ?

Your 5th. is the same with your first argument, and hath answer there, and if you would have understood his words, you might perceive he understood a reciprocall imputation, in which as we are asserted to be made partakers of his righteousness, he was of our finnes.

And justification of Christ as well as us might follow, if righteousness were communicated or imputed to him in Mr. Walkers speech by the Holy Ghost, or from us, but these are dreames and mistakes you say,

If communion be reciprocall, imputation is not, which yet is affirmed by the same breath, because this is an act of the Father, whereas communion floweth from the Holy Ghost, these are acts really differing, impossible to combine as one forme. &c.

The consequence is denied, and the reason that they are two differing acts ; both denote but the application of the matter, which is by analogy the forme, or introduction of it, and when you prove it because one is done by God the Father, the other by the Spirit, you seem to forget that both persons are one God, and that God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost justify: the Spirit is the Spirit of our God, and we are justified by the spirit of our God.

7. *Reciprocall imputation by it selfe cannot be the forme, because it comprehends two distinct acts of God, imputation of our finnes to Christ and of his righteousness to us, which really differ, now its impossible that any forme shoule be made of plurality of ingredients.*

They are the same acts of God ; God on mans believ-ing conferreth the righteousness of Christ on him, and acquitteth him of his finnes, they being by the same act put upon the score of Christ. This I suppose was his meaning.

And

And if our question were of a forme properly so calld, we might nearken to your axiome, and yet put you to worke to tell us what is *forma justi*, whether it hath not many ingredients, whether the formes of the severall elements are annihilated, or made matter, or are ingredients to the forme, and if not, how there can be a resolution of them, and how there are still their proper qualities; but this were to be wanton.

For accidents its manifest, learning as a forme maketh learned, and when we judge one so indeed, its from all or many sorts of learning, theres not onely a plurality but multiplicity of Learning.

2. *Its impossib[il]o, because onely the believing sinner is (as hath been fully proved) the mater of justification; now the forme is ever in conjunction with the mater proper to it, and never with any other: Christ being no believing sinner, is no fitting mater for the forme of that Justification to be coupled with it, it cannot be that imputation of sinnes to him should be the forme it selfe.*

That which is the foundation is sandy, that a believynge sinner is the mater of justification, its shewed to be so before; theres no justification of Christ asserted, and so no need that he should be a believynge sinner.

When God justifieth us he acquiteth us of our sinnes by the same act he removeth them from us, he translateth them to Christs account.

3. *No imputation whosover, or of whosover can be the forme of Justification. 1. Because its no righteousness, whereas a forme of Justification must of necessity be a righteousness; righteousness imputed is a righteousness, but the imputation of righteousness cannot be righteousness.*

Righteousnesse, its true, must be to make one righteous, but thatts the matter, imputation of it or it imputed is the forme, the introduction of this which is imputation hath the place of a forme.

2. And this introduction giveth denomination, it's a constitution of a man righteous.

9. *The Anker falleth off from hisss, and affirms the righteousness of Christ is sole to be this forme.*

He is like himselfe, and never meant other thing by it, as is seene hereby.

10. *In this voluminous multiformed description of the former cause, there is no mention of forgiuenesse of sinnes, as if they had no dealing together, Reformed Divines thinke them of neare affinity.*

And so do we, for the one is the cause, the other the effect or consequent, as is often laid.

3. *Neither can that opinion stand which maketh the imputation or application of the righteousness of Christ, the forme of Justification.*

This is the same, and how you have proved it we have seene, you need not repeate it, and yet you further argue against it.

If the righteousness of Christ be the matter and imputation thereof the forme, then one righteousness must be the forme of another righteousness, because the forme must needs be a righteousness; if the matter and forme be a righteousness, one must informe the other; a greater absurdity then the reason of any considering man can bear.

I deny the consequence. I deny the prooфе, that the forme must needs be a righteousness: the opinion is, the application of that righteousness is the forme, so the Author, you make, and you must bear the absurdity.

2. *Then what is less perfect shall be the perfection of that which is more perfect, now this imputation being by the acknowledgement of the Authors of it, somewhat inherent, must be of inferior worth, neither can it be conceived any thing shoulde be of a perfecting nature of the righteousness of Christ.*

1. That rule you apply here to accidents before appropriated to substances; to matter and forme properly so called: you must consider whether it will hold in both. The Author you speake of holds not that we are justified by, to be inherent in us: Its out of us in Christ, ours only by imputation, inherent they deny it to be, or our

our selves so justified, they distinguish betwene the denomination of one just and justified : the former is from what's inherent, the latter from what's extrinsecall.

And you may conceive, how Christ's righteousness being matter untill it be in conjunction with the forme Dav. p. 160. and
1 P. 162. that is imputed or applyed, hath not its end to which it is ordained, is but *an potestia*, and so by application actually attaineth it, our justification, and glory of Christ, and Gods grace. Then is it in its perfection, when as it produceth the effect & not before considered as matter.

4. *The Scriptures favour is not, neither do the Authors so much as pretend Scripture for it.*

Why do you answere the Scriptures this way if it be a truth ? that's tried, and shall be in examination of your answers.

Wilt. Bish. Davenant is absolutely against the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and pleadeth for the righteousness of Christ imputed.

The imputation of Christ's righteousness, or Christ's righteousness imputed to be the forme, is all one with them ; either denote the application of Christ's righteousness, the expressions are therfore indifferently used by them, and now as if it were different you dispute against that, Christ's righteousness imputed to be the forme.

1. *Because it is the effect: it cannot be the forme, it cannot have more habitude.*

The vanity of that rule and argument is opened before.

2. *These must needs hold the person justified, to bee the materiall cause thereof, on which supposition, I reason thus.*

No individuall forme can informe two severall subjects, really differing Christ and the sinner.

1^o. Their's no necessitie, the contrary hath been shewed, and so your supposition is begged, and what is built on it frivolous.

The righteousness of Christ, which we teach the matter of Justification, applied to thousands, the whole body of Christ, how different soever from themselves and

Christ denominateth all ; Christ just as inherent in him, us justified, as applyed to us.

Christ and we are one mystical body, all called Christ by vertue of which union and communion, that which is the heads, is communicated to the body; the husbands to the spouse, the Church.

3. And when as you object, wee are not one naturall body, not therefore capable of the same naturall forme.

You fight with your shadow: No man affirming either. When as you reason,

2. Then the same sinfullnesse of nature may informe them also, and Christ should be sinnefull and corrupte with the same, that is in the believer.

It's true, both wee are righteous by his righteousness, and he a sinner by our sinfullnes neither inherently, both by imputation.

3. Then the inerterious cause may be the forme.

True as applied or imputed, and if so bee there were not worth in it applied, it could not justify.

But the one wherim soe all the other alwaies inerterious, he that is alwaies without cannot be ever within.

Its true of naturall formes, not of all that are accidentall, when man is said to be justified it's by a Positive denomination : *It is not absolutely necessary that this denomination be taken from an inherens forme or shold suppose it, as when we say a man is beloved, honoured, freed, all those are strewly said of him in whom there is not found an inherens forme.*

4. Then is a believer reputed righteous with the righteousness of Christ; but that not to bee so I demonstrate, for bee that may be reputed righteous with the righteousness of Christ may be lawfully reputed never to have sinned: because that righteousness which admitteth sin in the same subject with it, can be none of the righteousness of Christ, the essentiall property whereof was to bee him who never sinned, but that a justified person should be reputed not to have sinned, is necessaries.

I deny that he that is reputed righteous with the righteousness of Christ may be reputed never to have sinned:

It is not at all
absolute necessari-
ty ut hec
denominatio
pertinet a for-
mam inherente aut
supponit formam
inherentem. Ut
cum hominem
dicimus amatum,
honosatum ablo-
cum; haec om-
nia de illo vere
discipiunt in quo
non reperitur
forma inherens.
Hoc prout est out
of Galatian, Par. ii.
and V. 14, p. 360.

I deny, that because his righteousness admitteth no sin in the subject who hath sin, it cannot by imputation be a believers : Its true it cannot be subjectively in us that are sinners.

It may be by imputation, so we that in our selves, are sinners, are in him righteous, as he who was in himselfe righteous was yet a sinner, b/ the imputation of our sins though not by inherencie.

5. *Then are they righteous with that which is meritorious, and may have the merit of such righteousness be ascribed to them: and they reputed workers of whatsoever is due to such a righteousness, which giveth them the redemption of the World.*

This reaon is a popish one, urged before, and fully satisfied by our Authors answering them, of which I have given a sufficient account before, and will not revile ~~any~~. You object *"was, meritorious as in him,* not as imputed to us, which you call a begging of the question, and is a position manifestly convicted of untruth. Let the reader Judge. 3 You adde.

2. *The meritoriousness of it must needs be essentiall to it, and inseparable, is goeth with it.*

I grant it for the person to whom its imputed, the believer receiveth it and its given him not for others to save them with, or communicate to them, but for themselves. And Authors cleare this in the place I named before.

6. *If the righteousness of Christ be the formal cause, either that which is moral alone, or ceremoniall alone, or mediatory alone, or of all, or some two.* But neither,

I answer the two first are the same, for the Ceremoniall righteousness was required in the second Commandement, being the manner of Gods worship contain'd in his word, which with his sufferings (you call mediatory) make up one full righteousness, the righteousness of our mediator, that by which imputed we are justified. His active and passive obedience : against this we have nothing, your 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and last, are Arrows shot at

random, they hurt not your opponents nor profit your selfe. and lastly, It is the confession of the learnedest abbess, of the way of imputation which hath been opposed in this Treatise, denye the righteousness of Christ imputed to be the formall cause of justification.

Wheras Dr. Prideaux denieth that we are formally justified by the righteousness of Christ imputed: His words immediately following are of an inhering forme.

*An non formam
quam liber inha-
rentem qua
formaliter justi-
denominetur
semper explosi-
mus.*

Dr. Downham teacheth it a false charge that we hold our selves formally righteous, by that righteousness which is not in us, but out of us in Christ, that not we but Christ was formally just by that which is in him.

And that hee doth not deny the righteousness of Christ imputed to us to be the formall cause of justification, see by two passages of the same Author, the one immediately before, the other after. The title of that fifth Chapter is, and that against your Mr. A. W. *That the formall cause of Justification is the imputation of Christ's righteousness.*

And having said, *But the thing wherein chiefly they erre,* is, *That with Socinus the Heretique they deny the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and consequently do hold, that neither the active nor passive obedience of Christ, is that which is imputed to us for righteousness. What then? Forsooth the act of faith.* He addeth, *Of these mens error I shall not need to say much in this place, because besides that which hath been already delivered, in the 3. Chapter I have plentifully and fully proved in my whole 4. h. Booke, that the righteousness of Christ is the matter which is imputed to Justification, and in my whole 5th. Booke that the imputation of Christ's righteousness is the forme of Justification.* And having laid, he wondered they could be so absurd, &c. these words follow, *But we teach that Christ's righteousness both habitually and actually by which he was formally just, is the matter and the imputation thereof the forme of Justification.*

We say that the righteousness of Christ is selfe is not the forme

mall cause of justification, or that by which we are formally just, but the imputation of it, &c. The righteousness whereby a man is formally just is inherent in himselfe, for what is more intrinsical then the forme. But Christ's righteousness is not inherent in us more then our sinne was inherent in him; And yet as he was made sinne or a sinner by our sinnes, not formally (God forbid) but by imputation, so we are made righteous by his righteousness, not formally (as we are justified, or in our selves but in him, viz. by imputation).

Not formally or in our selves, inherently is the thing he denyeth, not the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and so all.

Thus Dr. *Davenant* *

ad forma Phisica, supple tamen vicem ejus, atque illo sensu recte dici formalem causam justificacionis nostre, ubi deest formalis intrinseca seu inherentis, where he explaineth that *recte*, c. 27. p. 362.

And thus I follow you passing to another opinion,
p. 28. *Remission of sinnes wherof bath the fairest and largest* . P. 28.
quare in the judgements and writings of Protestant Divines,
to what is done in the former Treatise. 1. and 5. Chap. you add
2 eminent Divines. That you are to prove, is that remission of sinnes is the formall cause of Justification.

Pareus, the light of whose reading and judgement together could discover no other opinion touching the formall cause of Justification, either in the Fathers or any chiefe Protestant writers, but that it should stand only in remission of sinnes.

In the words you cite or place, there's not one word that remission of sinnes is the formall cause of Justification.

obedientiam esse justitiam nostram, et justificationem sola remissione peccatorum dñi, which he saith is proved by an Argument à materia, an other à forma justificationis; the proof from the formal cause is, scriptura totam justificationem nostram definit remissione peccatorum proper sanginem Christi. Ergo sola sanguinis effusio est id cuius imputatione justificamur, et remissio peccatorum est tota justitia nostra; here though the effect be remission, the cause is the blood of Christ imputed; *as the righteousness of Christ is the matter of the imputation thereof in the forme, as it's called, and also wrong,* Omnia confundit nos morte Christi justificari cum proper causa habeamus remissionem peccatorum, p. 374.

* Atque hoc ex
tradicum licet
non habeat in
nobis evidenti-
erit.

Imputation of righteousness is the cause, remission

Remissio peccatorum fit per justitiam imputatam perfectam; *Casit. de justif. 389.* and also where to Bellarmine. Falsum quicquid Apologum ex non imputacione peccatorum, colligere imputationem justitiae. Imo hunc non ex illa colligit sed per illam declarat ut cuius textum adipicimus manifestum est praecedit enim imputatio justitiae, ver. 6. Sequitur exegeticè remissio tecum non imputatio peccatorum, ver. 7. 8.

And when as he calleth it our whole justification, how can it be the formall cause of it selfe? neither where it is so termed if you shew the same, can it be maintained.

As for Mr. *Gataker*, though he cite many that hold justification to consist in remission of finnes, yet his words are, *for my part I deems erroneous, and suppose I have elsewhere evidently shewed it so to be*: and its marvaile you would quote him in this cause. The thing is evident, neither will your seeming large sense given to him excuse you.

When as *Piscator* had said, *our justification before God and remission of finnes are truly one and the same*.

Mr. *Gataker*, *justification and remission of sins plainly are not the same*.

And though he hold them not to differ as the whole and part, he addeth, *it is rather a necessary consequent of entire justification*.

And when as *Piscator* had said, he had onceand againe demonstrated, *remission of finnes and imputation of rightes onesse, to be plainly one and the same*.

Mr. *Gataker* answereth, Yea but this is not as yet demonstrated by you, neither truely will it ever be demonstrated.

As for the 3. Mr. *A.W.* He is the man whence you must be denominated, what constant opposition hee found, is knowne.

For prooфе making you promise:

1. *Justification being an action hath no forme properly called, nor any forme properly a part of it.*

2. *The resholt it bath is but as it makes an alteration in the person, or rather his condition.*

3. *The precise effect of that all is the forme.*

4. Our Question is of a sinners justification by the blood of Christ.

5. We inquire of that which is constitutive, Gods making a man righteous, whence declaring followeth: And thus I proceed to demonstrate the truth of that proposition, that remission is the formall cause of Justification.

1. I take granted, your fourth; its of such a justification.

2. Its granted, it hath no proper forme, and that properly it can not be a part, yet there is a forme, and that's a part, it's constitutive as your selfe, essentiaall, a part.

3. That it makes a reall change, for it makes a sinner just, it maketh an unjust man righteous.

3. That the effect of the act of God justifying is the forme, I deny, its whole justification, and all such essentiaall parts as make it up, and you must remember the formes act hath efficacy, for *datus est*. see c. 3. diff. 1.

4. It's granted, it's constitutive of justification, as *animus rationalis* of a man. And now for your Demonstrations.

1. Because remission of finnes is the first precise effect of that act, therefore its the formal cause of Justification, there's no other imaginable effect intervening, there's an immediate connexion betweene justification and the sinners absolution, when its called Justification from sin, 13 Acts 38 so 6 Rom. 7. *he that is dead is justified from sinne, this is the first privilege that comes upon a sinner by meanes of justification.*

1. I deny the consequence, the effect is passive justification as you distinguish, and that signifieth most properly and most frequently that compleate and entire effect, wherein all their severall influences and contributions meet and center together, p. 38. Whole justification, the intire effect, and the forme are not the same, the forme is but a part of a thing, and cannot be the entire effect.

2. I deny remission of finnes, the first precise effect, ther's imputation or application of righteousness, of which justification is an effect, as is shewed out of Mr.

Worson, 1 st. p. 84. of righteousnesse communicated, on which pardon followeth.

Neither doth their connection prove it, such is there betweene sanctification and justification; and for that place *Acts 13.* you urg'd it to this purpose once before, and have an answere in the first argument.

2. *Because remission of sinnes giveth denomination of justified, it is the forme.*

Grant this, (though the illustration be not by whitening and whitning, wherein you make whitenesse the forme, which is the effect, the form is whitning application) you must prove the minor, that it denominateth, which you do thus.

If a sinner be therefore and thereby justified because he hath his sinnes remitted unto him, then remission of sinnes giveth denomination of the justified to him.

This is a meere begging of the question, what's to be proved; and I deny a sinner therefore justified, unless you prove it, justification by an effect, or thereby, your Reason.

Because Justification it is a vindication or exemption from punishment.

It is so in effect, that is that followeth, but somewhat is supposed thereunto, just making and being just, else will it be the *justification of a wicked person abomination to the Lord,* as both the Scripture, and Divines pleading the same.

3. *Remission of sinnes is the formal cause of Justification because it is that alteration and change that's caused in the person justified by that act of God.*

1. I deny the consequence, every change or alteration the person, *is not the forme.*

By that act of God is not the forme, so peace of conscience should be so, for its an alteration which supposeth pardon, which supposeth imputation of righteousnesse, whence justification and so pardon, &c.

2. So is justification it felse in that change that's made

made, yet is it not therefore the forme of it selfe, nay its
an effect of the forme. Your Reason.

*It's a politique act, and it hath a justable effect, not a Morall,
the change is not so, now, then this there's no other imaginable
act, before this he was under guilt, now freed by this.*

It's a divine act, and though it be granted politique
and that the effect, there's a Morall change, such a man
as hath his sinnes forgiven him, was under guilt but
now free; true, hee was also unjust whence that guilt,
and now he is righteous, *confinised righteous, holy and un-
blamable, white as snow, whiter by a beauty put on him,*
whence remission a consequent, here's an other change

*4. That which makes a justified person compleatly righteous
before God is the formall cause of Justification, this cannot be
denied by our kearest adversaries.*

I answer, making is ambiguous, every cause maketh
the efficient the finall, the materiall, the formall, a
blunt man might make exception. But let it passe, let
us see your assumption.

*But remission of sinnes maketh a justified person formally and
compleatly righteous, because he is as cleare from sinne or the
guilt as he that kept the Law and never transgressed.*

G.

I answer, remission maketh not formally righteous,
and I deny the reason, for though he be without sinnes
guilt, nay so righteous, the cauile is righteousness im-
puted, supposed, by Christ's obedience we are confinised rig-
hteous.

*5. If remission of sinnes be perfect and compleatly righteous.
then is it the formall cause of Justification.*

The light set up to this.

*Because no perfect or compleat righteousness can be found in
any man that hath sinned, but that which is given and conferred
by God in his Justification.*

*But remission of sinnes is a compleat righteousness, which
proposition hath been oft already exalted upon the Throne of
evidence, and unquestionableness of truth.*

It is and hath been as often denied, and with reason

too: be it so, let the Reader judge; but now we must take a further demonstration.

I bat righteousnesse which needeth not feare the presence of a most distract judgement of God, is a compleat righteousnesse. But remission is such, it will hold weight and measure.

That which you are to prove, is that remission is a compleat righteousnesse, this you prove it by, beggett what's the question that it's righteousnesse, every thing that will abide the presence of God is not by and by righteousnesse, in our love there's no feare, yet is it not righteousnesse by which we are justified, when as you adde.

What shall binder but that immediately on remission of sinnes ensue a perfect union of love and peace between them.

In these you seeme to lay down the issue of pardon to be a union of love and peace betweene them; it's true theres a love and peace that followeth, but as for an union as if that followed and did not go in nature before, is not to be suffered, we have shewed the word faith, *in whom we have redemption, remission of sinnes in his blood*, its what we have in him, and therefore must be first in and have union, it's what we have by communion, participation of his righteousnesse as we have shewed, which supposeth union, remission of sinnes without union is remission of sins not by and in, but out of Christ.

6. You argue. *Forgiveness is the formall cause, because it is the righteousnesse which God imputeth in Justification, which you prove to follow, because the righteousnesse which God imputeth in justification, must needs be the formall cause thereof.*

The minor is the assertion of the Holy Ghost, Rom. 4. 6. God imputing righteousnesse, ver. 7. is interpreted to be forgiving iniquities and covering of sinne.

1. It is our tenet, that righteousnesse imputed is the formall cause of justification.

2. But we deny that righteousnesse to be forgivenesse of sinnes: It's not righteousnesse; It's an effect or consequent of justification by the righteousnesse of Christ imputed,

imputed, and of that righteousnesse of Christ we have facewed, the Apostle to speake, ver. 6. and ver. 11. and this not our owne but as received by faith of the God of our salvation.

7. *Remission of finnes reacheth home unto, and is given to men by God for their justification, therefore it is the formall cause thereof, this is evident, because by the formall cause we meane nothing else but passive justification.*

I answere. 1. Many things may be given by God for justification some waies or other, which yet are not the formall cause thereof, the word and faith are given for justification.

2. I deny remission given for justification; I assert justification given for pardon, for it is its effect, or consequent, as hath been often shewed; Rom. 5. 16. mention is made of remission, a gift: There's also mention of the gift of righteousness, whence justification and pardon also, ver. 18. 19.]

And if remission of finnes be justification passive, the effect of God justifying, it cannot be the formall cause thereof, it hath as good an efficient, so the formall cause active thereunto as your selfe, where you name that distinction. par. 2. p. 37. It can not be cause and effect both, before and after it selfe, the whole and a part.

Lastly, *Remission is the formall cause, because that & not imputing sins signifie the same priviledge, which you prove because the Holy Ghost interpreteth the righteousnesse which God imputeth by non-imputation of finnes, Rom. 4. 6. compared with ver. 8. and the righteousnesse that is imputed in the formall cause.*

1. I grant that righteousnesse imputed is the formall cause. 2. And that remission and non-imputation are the same: Yet deny the consequence, and that because remission of finnes is not righteousnesse, neither that which is imputed, the text calleth it faith, which is not forgivenesse of finnes, and being faith, it must be in a figurative sense, takeing in the righteousnesse of

Christ's righteousnesse, as we have proved from ver. 6, and ver. 11. otherwise there is noe perfect righteousnesse to be imputed, noe formall cause. I have often shewed non imputation the consequent of imputation of righteousnesse. And thus for your reasons. I shall be ready to examine any other reasons, and you shall finde an answer to what you say in the following Chapters.

1. Your Answer to that objection; *Remission of finnes is no true righteousnesse*, in the 4th. conclusion, is there satisfied.

2. That objection, *That the righteousnesse of Christ must be joyned with remission of finnes to make the compleate forme of justification* is none of ours, see c. 11. 1. par. of your Treatise.

3. That objection, *that remission of finnes is the consequent or effect of justification*, therefore not the cause, answered in this Chapter is there maintained. Mr. Gataker telleth Piscator so often.

4. 5. *That the righteousnesse of Christ imputed or imputation of the righteousnesse which is the same*, is the forme, is maintained against your exceptions.

6. None object that *the communion between Christ and the believer* is this formall cause: this also is cleared in this Chapter.

7. That objection, *that justification may be where there is no remission of finnes, and remission where there is no Justification*, cleared c. 3. of this 2. par. and sect. 29. of this, is not objected by us, what is there layd downe is there examined.

And thus by what is laid in answer, the Reader may judge of your description of Justification, for brevities sake I avoyd the running over of the same things, and so passe to your 5. Chapter.



CHAP. V.

Wherein S C R I P T U R E S are
cleared, brought for the imputation of Christ's
Active obedience with their true sense
according to the Judgement of the best
Expositors of the Protestant Party.

YOur first Section containeth a Preface, and its Application : the Preface.

When Men conceive thereby thoughts countenanced from heaven in the Scriptures, their confidence lifts up in selfe very high. The reason you give is : The opinion in this case being their owne, must needs have a strong and perfect sympathy with all the powers of nature, yet unsanctified and so must needs ingage these, and being looked on as a divine truth — It ingageth all the powers of grace to contend for it. Hence an excesse of zeale for maine enanche — resolutions of sacrificing credit, name, estate; friends, himselfe upon the honour and service of it in case it bee opposed.

*One signe thereof is the maine anions are ambitious to beapo
m citations of Scripture prooofs, without end to overwhelm their
adversaries, when as it is to be suspelld that what is everywher
is no where, when men barke about for Scriptures, and find not
those that freely offer themselves.*

The Application.

*The Scriptures are manywher are mistred, by the masters of
Imputation which wee oppose, amongst all theirs not one that
peaketh plainly or directly to the busines, they speake not, but the
spirit of men in them, and now come to give a perfect account, by
examination — the greatest part have bin touched and clostred
and*

and you begin with those of the Old Testament.

I Answ. Your ~~refuse~~ is common, I grant all: The Masters of imputation whom you oppote (as you call them) may retort all on your selfe; ~~mines now we are fabu-~~
~~lanarrayn~~; and may lay the Man hath a face that cannot blush, who pretends this opinion of yours, and interpretation to be according to the best Expositors of the Protestant Party.

It's knowne those were the adversaries of *Socinus*, of *Arminius*, Mr. *Wotton* Papists and your selfe, who deny imputation of the righteousness of Christ, and are againt the figurative sense of those words, *Ro. 4.* I have shewed it, and appeal to the World.

The Masters you elsewhere instance in Doctor *Davenant*, and Doctor *Dowham*, trace the same steps, and are above your envie. I hope I the least of thouousands not worthy a name amongst them shall bee able to shew it. Away with vaine words, let us goe to downe right blowes. Ile follow you foot by foot and though I cannot find who alleadeth them, and consequently informe my selfe of their following the same (you mentioning not the Objectors or Authors whence you take them) you laying them downe also as weakely as can be. I am sure without the force I find in our Authors.

Yet I will examine all as I am able.

The covering of sin, is by some conceiv'd to be by the Active righteousness or obedience of Christ, which God imputing coves-
th all their sins therewith.

Answ. We confess covering of sinnes, non-imputation and forgivenesse all one, and that these are done by Justification as consequents thereof: Yet is there wherewithal this I assert the obedience of Christ constituting us righteous, *s. Rom. 19.* I say not the active obedience all one, but the Passive also. That Mr. *Gas.* and *Piscator*, and *Barres*, hold imputed to this effect you must if you be not on *Socinian* part, and if you hold that, the active being an essentiaall requisite is not to be excluded, as before

The

The Prophet hath this Phrase, *my God hath clothed mee
with the garments of salvation, her bath covered mee with the
Robe of righteousness, 61. Jes. 10.* as there is a covering of sin
ther's wherewith all.

The Apostle, Rom. 4. 6. 11. besides non-imputation
mentioneth imputation of righteousness, on which non-
imputation followeth.

*Authors thus ordi-
narily Mr. Zanchie
speaking of, infor-
macy of inheriting
righteousness,*

*faith, opus habet, cum perfecta Christi justitia quia tanquam veste pretiosa illius labes contingantur iuxta
illud, Psalmi 33. Beati quorum remissio sunt in iniurias, et quorum tecla sunt peccata, &c. prouide a
potito hanc iustitiam per se solum confidans et ab altera distinguens, dixit se nolle inveniri, &c. ad-
Philip. 3. 9.*

Exclare vero etiam Iustinus Martir, Epistola ad diaconum : Quid aliud (inquit) peccata nostra te-
gen et potius quam Christi justitia? In quo alio nos iniqui et impii pro iustis haberi possimus nisi in solo
Dei filio? O dulcem percutationem; O imperceptibilem artificium; et beneficia ex peccatum orna-
nta in superantes ut iniurias quidem multorum in justo uno a scandente iustitia autem unius faciat ut
multi in isti iustificantur, *Parus, whence he proved what he had said that the Gospel evidently witnesseth
God - acc. regere iniurias, nisi per Christi obedientiam, c. 4. ad Rom. ad dub. 3. quarta denique p. 325.*

Hoc (innocentia Christi qua nos induxit) non instruit aliud peccatorum remissionem in fide obt-
inetur; Hujus probitate velate nostrae fortes et imperficiuntur iustitiae unditae non imputantur. Sed velut
sepulchrum ostegantur ne in iudicium Dei veniant. *Cat. 1. 3. c. 14. 8c. 18.*

Vb; in Christianum infiti funus ideo justi apparemus coram deo quia ejus innocentia continguntur nostre
imputantes 1.3. c. 17. 8c. 10.

Fides ullen sudum hominem Deum Christi iustitiam induatur, *Cat. ad Phil. 3. 9.*
*Who also out of Ambrose speak that of Jacob in Esaus apparel. Ita non sub Christi primogeniti nostra
fratris praecincta puritate defensere w testimonium iustitiae a conspectu Dei referamus. Epif. 1. 3. c. 11. p. 12.
Tegi dicuntur peccata, — um quia Christi iustitia sunt expiata tum quia cadens nobis per fidem im-
putata tanquam nitidissima veste operiuntur, ne in conspectu Dei deformitas corruventur, *Tatius
Epif. de Jeph. p. 491.**

These are enough to shew that besides that remission, there is by Scriptures and our authors, the righteousness of Christ, by which there is that covering of sin. What you speak against this that the active obedience of Christ cannot cover.

*Seeing sinne is wholly dissolved by the passive obedience of
Christ, and this before the imputation of the Active obedience
of Christ and that that which is wholly dissolved needes
no cover.*

We have no such opinion, that sin is forgiven by the passive obedience, imputed before the active we hold the imputation of both together, which make up our full righteousness, and that by these imputed we have Justification, and so concerning dissolution or remission of sins, in regard of guilt and punishment.

It cannot be by the Passive alone, its insufficient seeing the active is absolutely necessary to the merit therof and an essentiall requisite to life, *ex concessis.*

4. *You say the active obedience of Christ is so farre from being a covering of sinne, that it is rather a meane of discovery, setting it out.*

I Answer that's not to purpose, yet you grant it an essentiall requisite, to the Passive obedience, and it's doing away our sinne.

As for that crotchet of yours about covering of sinne it crosteth your self and your authors who make them the sinne, and I will not spend time in consideration of it not being to our purpose.

2 Place. p. 3. Jer. 23. 6. and 33. 16. *Where it is said Christ shall be called the Lord our righteousness.* You answier,

1. *It is not said the righteousness of the Lord shall be our righteousness, nor that it shall be imputed to us for righteousness.*

1. When it's said he shall be the Lord our righteousness, It must needs be so in regard of his righteousness.

2. His being our righteousness infoldeth faith, receiving Christ the Lord, 2 Col. 6. *our righteousness may bee rightly supplied, and that implyeth Gods giving him for that, the imputation of it:* the Apostle, Rom. 4. 6. supplyeth the word. And S^t. Pauls desire is to bee found in him, *not having his own righteousness.*

Mr. Zanchius, *est enim Christus ipse per fidem apprehensas quatenus pro nobis legem perfecit-*
sunt nos of God righteousness, and we are said to be made the righteousness of God in him, 1 Cor. 1. 30. and 2 Cor. 5. ult.

ma obedientia servavit, quatenus item ipse sua morte et Sanguine peccata nostra expiavit, patiique reconciliavit, &c. His respectibus Christus est justitia nostra, ideo merito Apostolus eum vocat justitiam nostram, 1 Cor. 1. De quo antea Hieron. 23. Et hoc est nomine eius quo vocabunt eum Iehova justitia nostra, in j.c. Epist. ad Philip. p. 196.

So Paræus when as in answering Bellarmine he had sajd of Luther.

softram justitiam; addet quem sciam Merozynicum si oppugnat aduersarius, certe non Lutherum impugnat sed spiritum sanctum blasphemat qui Christianum ex parte vocat justitiam nostram 23. Let. 6. 22 a. 6. 1. 30. Castig. 1. 1. 4. 2. 418, 419.

Sed meonymico
Iesu dixit fidem
1. Christum fide
apprehensas esse

See c. 10. p. 501, 502, where 1 Cor. 1. 30, and this place of. Ier. are vindicated, pro imputata Christi iustitia. In answer to which, Bell. giveth us the whole cause, in Para. 16. & Annex. Ch. C. 17. p. 34, 35. Bell. cap. 1. p. 145. de Iust. Tom. q. 5. Chomier de Iustitia, v. 8. sub eiusdem place, &c. He proveth that we are not non nostra inheritare, where he citeth an excellent testimony opening this text, Cirillus Glaphyron. 5. c. 29. item 2.

Hic est nomen ejus quod vocaverit eum Dominus Iosephus in Prophetis, regnabit enim super nos iustus rex Christianus iustitiam fecit nomen vero ipsi Iosephus hoc est iustitia Dei, iustificati enim sumus in ipso. Idcirco etiam dicit Deus te Pater appropinquat celeriter iustitia mea et misericordia mea revelabatur mihi. cordia enim ex iustitia nobis fatus est Christus a deo ac Pare.

So where he preacheth us justified, aliena iustitia, c. 17, he citeth this text, Selt. 2.

To which I may add Doctor Downham who two times urgeth this text to this purpose, I. t. c. 3. p. 5. l. 4. c. 2. par. 2. Which is enough to give a taste of this Scripture by Protestant Divines and that against Papists. To me self,

3. It is against Grammaticall and Rhetoricall importance of the expression of the words, disagreeing from Scripture phrase, to put such a sense on them as (to ist our righteousness by imputation, the imputation of a person was never heard off before.

That's your opinion, its not so of learned men, as you heare, its no more then Christ being made to us of God, righteousness, or that our being made the righteousness of God in him of which before: Our righteousness implieth imputation or donation of God to us believing, for righteousness by which we must stand holly and unreprovable and unblamable in the sight of God.

3. The direct meaning is. Hes shall be acknowledged by the Jews, she great author and procurer of that righteousness or justification in the sight of God, for righteousness is put for Justification, Cap. 3. p. 3.

1. I answere Justification and righteousness differ as cause and effect as in your, 3. c. Selt. 3. righteousness is the cause, Justification the effect.

2. Grant this place then to be meant, he shall be called the Author and procurer of our Justification, but yet by righteousness which is a cause thereof: We yield it the meritorious cause, and the matter, and being applied, imputed, ours, the formall cause: so that the direct meaning establisheth our interpretation, wee granting him the Lord our righteousness, by his righteousness

nesse made ours to produce this effect, Justification: I hope you that interpret him the author of Justification will not deny righteousesse, the cause. And as for application you must grant, hee must of necessity bee our righteousness, that he may be to us the author of justification.

1. Thus according to his name is his work, he justifieth us by his righteousness applied.

2. Thus is he the procurer of our righteousness and the effect thereof Justification, which are not but where hee is our righteousness, that is, his righteousness is applied.

3. And thus remission of sins shall have it's due place, to bee an inseparable consequent of Justification, or just making, as that's an effect of the Lord, becoming our righteousness, this putteth both those and all consequent priviledges. And thus I passe to the fourth par.

Third Place Sc. 4.

Some have digged for imputation in that field, Jes. 45. 24. Surely shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength.

You suggest.

1. There are severall readings and interpretations of this Scripture. And

2. Answer there's not the least breaching of imputation so much wondered after.

3. The direct meaning and import is doubtles, only a profession made by him of his free justification by God in and through Christ.

I answer, when at last you give us the true and direct meaning, it was vaine to pretend severall readings and interpretations, and want of pregnancy in the place, to build a disputable point of faith on.

2. When as it's a profession of free justification by God in and through Christ, it must be by Christs righteousness and in him, which denoteth application, imputation.

3. The sense is most plaine in the words of the interpreter

preters In Christ the Lord I have righteousness, having it infoldeth Gods giving it and our application by faith, we grant justification and pardon to be as effects infolded. Its a profession of justification by righteousness possest in Christ.

I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soule shall be joyfull in my God : for he hath clothed me with the garment of salvation, he hath covered me with the Robe of righteousness. These garments and Robe are conceiv'd to be the righteousness of Christ imputed as a Robe or Garment put on them, wherin and by which they stand justified in the sight of God.

*Loc. ut Jef. 61.
10.*

You answer.

1. This cloathing with righteousness, &c. bare expressions chiefly, if not only of the Church of the Jewes in their restoration from Babylon, if not that under which they lie now at this day, external and temporall, not Justification by Christ.

Neither by the Robe of righteousness are we to understand the whole obedience of Christ to the Morall Law, there not being word, fyllable, lesser, tittle, leading to such an interpretation, but in the effect of the righteousness that is of the truth and faulfullnesse or graciousnes of God: or both deliverance from captivity, safety and other sweet and comfortable priviledges.

Grant this of the Jewes, then or now, Its not only: as by the 3 first Ver. It's of Christ, and theres neither Jew nor Gentile in him, & preaching the Gospel Its not to be confind.

Grant it of the Jewes especially now.

That it's of externalls and temporalls and not of justification by Christ, is very inconsiderately asserted.

1. Deliverance, safety and other sweet and comfortable priviledges, confessed seeme to import more then outwards and temporalls.

The 3 first veries shew that Prophet and Christ anoynted to preach other things then temporalls, there ore other evills on them, then temporalls supposed and remedies preached. There's more in that ver. 6. ther's the instauracion of divine worship. Christ shewes that he will adorn his Church his Spouse, with righteousness,

Cultus divini
Christus ostendit
se ornatum ec-
clesiam sponsum
suam iustitiae vita
et gloria eterna.
Tremel. & Ius.
prof. ad caput.
sc.

life, and eternall glory. Instauration as Sculleton in locum.
there's more externall, ver. 6. internall, ver. 8. In
everlasting joy, ver. 7. I will direct their works in truth, Scul.
More in that, *I will make an everlasting Covenant with them,*
ver. 8. There's Christ and righteousnesse and pardon
and all spirituall blessings with Christ. It shall be seene
ver. 9.

God shall be their God, they shall greatly rejoice in him, for
this, *he hath clothed me, &c.*

And what is meant by this, let Saint John shew you
19. Rev. 7. 8. where the Spouse of Christ returning shall
be clothed with fine linnen cleane and white, which is the righte-
ousnesse of the Saints. God shall do it by application of
the righteousnesse of Christs Robes of righteousness, gar-
ments of salvation of all sorts. But let us proceed. You
say,

2. *If we carry those metaphors in and understand them of*
Justification by Christ, the promise supposed to be contained in
them, and to be made to the Church, will not be suitable or proper
theremunto, because the Church is already and at all times clothed
with the robe of the righteousness of Christ, in such a sense,
that is, in a justified condition by him: *Ye her Justification is*
that which gives her her very being as she is his Church.
its to promise what they have, so that doubletless is no Spirituall
priviledge, at least not justification by Christ of all other.

1. That these are supposed ever clothed with the
righteousnesse of Christ, justified, then, or now is wor-
thy consideration further.

Then though there were some justified they were
but few: many the most *Vnircircumcised in heart* in their
sinnes, onely justified *Sacramentozenns* in regard of Circumcision, the signe and seale of the righteousness of
Faith, outwardly circumcised, a truth of many, elect
ones, for their present state, to be justified in their call
when God shall call them to repentance and pardon
them. Then Gods promise is to worke these, and so
their returne, *44 Ie.* and yet the Church. Now

-Now, they are not called, not justified, cut off for not submission to the righteousness of God for establishing their own righteousness, to be justified when as the Lord shall call them.

I deny then that promise not suitable to them that they doe not need justification: your supposition that this was and shall be that peoples state before their call is groundlesse.

That justification gives a Church the very being of a Church as this was Visible is groundlesse, uncircumcised in heart were members of the Church; yea hypocrites are so: even such as are the Catholique Church or invisible ones, Saints indeed are first in natures order sanctified, before justified; the promise of pardon is made to repentance, *if we confess our sinnes, he is faistfull and just to forgive us, &c. wash you make you cleane, put away the evill of your doing, cease to do evill, learn to do well, and then if your sinnes were, &c.* 1 Jes. The Scriptures abound this way; yea in order of nature before sanctification there's effectuall call: call to faith and call to fellowship with Christ whence that sanctification and so justification, and it's call that giveth her her being as she is the Church. *Ecclesia is of course as you know calling out that a consequent priviledge of those that are called out, distinct whom he called he justified,* Rom. 8. so that this objection is of no value.

Lastly, *If we understand it of outwards and temporalls, as Musculus and other Interpreters, the Metaphor will be found sweet and lively, and consonant to other Scriptures.*

The Jewes and other Nations cloathed themselves according to their condition, they had times for sackcloth, they were now as Captives, prisoners; he will change their estate and make them free, possessors of their owne land, honourable, all this is signified by the change of their habitts, proportioning clothes to their dignitie, so 19. Rev. 7, 8. which you cleare and answer by the way) It's not of justification or righteousness, but the great honour Christ will bestow on them justified long before.

It's given in remembrance of her righteousness, that is, her holyness, &c. under persecution.

Pure and shining linnen, that is the bright glory, wherwith the Church is invested, is said to be the righteousness of the Saints, because the reward of it, the linnen is, &c. a reason why the Saints so arrayed.

It's Paralell ss. c. 3, 4. these shall walke in white, for they are worthy, they are the reason. So the great City was clothed in fine linnen and purple, 18.Rev. 16. There's nothing inward meant, touching the inward coniunction of the Church, much less his justification by the all overrighteousnesse of Christ, and it's strange to build a dogmatically point of faith upon metaphorical expressions, there being no plaine ones to warrant it.

1. I believe not that *Musculus* or any other, hold it of temporalls, onely, *Musculus* is not in mine hands. I have instanced in *Sculptetus*; and *Tremelius*, and *Innissius* are cleare for spiritualls; if all the interpreters in the world were of that opinion, unlesse I were blind I must oppose them, as by the particulars in the Chapter; of which before.

2. I grant outward temporalls to have their place, freedome, their lands, honour and that habits were proportionable by other places of Scripture. I deny there was not spirituall freedome, right to the creatures, and true honour, which is of God, confisiting in spirituall Priviledges.

Nay the latter are, what are cast in over and above.

c Jus et authoritas ecclesia vindicata per Christum in res omnes creatos que per antichristum nulli et ignominiosi status, precedentis illustratur, in ver. 6.7.

Jun. & Tremel. Note that ^c the right and authority of the church over all creature things vindicated, which is illustrated by opposition of a miserable and ignominious estate foregoing.

But there are far higher priviledges promised, Christ was annointed for other matters, as in the 3. first, &c.

There is that acceptable year of the Lord, reconciliation with God, redemption, comfort. They shall be trees of righteousness. Their is an everlasting covenant in which God becomes their God in Christ: shewing it in sanctification, justification, adoption, in giving the spirit to all those ends, to the exercise and

and growth of grace the saving of the soule, and resurrection of the body. These are prime blessings, and primely intended; though you (as if the Old testament contained none of these) see nothing but externals, temporalls.

3: If sweetnesse and livelynes, and consonancy to the Scripture, be our card and compasse. Let any spirituall man judge.

1. If there be sweetnes and life in temporall freedome, possessions, honour. Spirituall excelleth, it's of an higher kind, ther's no comparison between them, were man in the greatest want of the one, having the other, hee were an happy man: and on the other tide, miserable in the midst of those without these: that man did never tast God in these, and is blind wholly that judgeth otherwise.

2. For agreement with other Scriptures.

This hath so, as where mention is made of *putting on Christ*, where we are said to be found in him, as *Paul. 3. Ph. 9.* When hee desired to bee found in him, *not having his owne righteousness*, which importeth that hee would bee found in, is the righteousness of Christ: It's as in agreement, of which see our examination of your 6. Argument out of *Phil. 3. 9.* and what is urged in defence of *32. ph. 1.* the first Scripture passing which

Let us consider those in the *Revelation 19. and 3.* and see whether there bee nothing inward meant, or of the inward condition of the Church, much lesse Justification by the active obedience of Christ.

The words are, *And to her was graunted that shee should be arrayed in fine linnen, cleene and white, for the fine linnen is the righteousness of Saints.*

Christ the Husband in the call of his people (his ancient people the Jewes, as it seemeth) *gresh her to bee arrayed, clotheth her with fine linnen, cleane and white*, which is explained to bee the *righteousnesse of the Saints*, the righteousness which God giveth them, and they receive by faith.

Her's not onely the priviledges and returne, but the righteonses of the Saints, a spirituall thing which you can not exclude by your interpretation, and it's expressed.

2. Though metaphors are used, they are explained, they meane the righteonsesse of the Saints.

3. When as this is a dogmaticall point of faith. 1. it should have moved you to more care and feare of adventuring to oppose it against all the reformed Churches: Your error if it bee proved, will be the greater, in regard of Preaching and printing against it, it will bee against a dogmaticall point of faith.

Let us now to the interpretation of chief Protestants; you have brought not one for your interpretation which yet was your promise.

As in the argument of that, 61. Jes. Jun. faith, ^d Christ sheweth that he will adorne his Church his spouse with righteonses.

Are speaking of the ornament of his Church sheweth whence it bath is, that it is given by her husband Christ to her, that is, that it is given by Christ for it is the office of the husband only to cloth his spouse, and to give her rayment, then he calleth the garment linnenpure and shining, that is the white garment of innocencie good works, then which nothing is more shoneing before the Lord, nothing more pure. 3. He expoundeth this rayment to be nothing else but the Iustifications of the Saints, therefore is the Church adorned with the Iustifications of Christ; that is, with the merits and righteonsesse of her husband; this the Apostle said, Phil. 3. 9. That I may be found, &c, the church didum, stola est innocentie, bonorum operum quibus nihil est splendidius coram Domino nihil purius. 30. exponit vestitum hunc nihil aliud esse, quam iustificationem sanctorum. igitur vestitur sponsa Christi iustificationibus, hoc est meritis et iustitia sui Sponsi. Hoc etiam dixit Apostolus ad Philip. 3. 9. Comperiar in ipso non habet mea iustitiam qua ex lege est sed qua est ex fide Christi, illam in quaenam qua est ex Deo iustitiam per fidem. Hac iustitia ornatur sponsa.

Qua squalida Hearken to learned Brightman, Illi alteri) that you may see it to have the same scope with that, 61. Jes.) panns obita ja.

cebat antea bylline vester dantur quibus deformem suam nudum operat. Hac autem Byllus est Jesus Christus factus uolter ad iustitiam et salutem per imputationem; qua ueste carbant Iudei dum respuentes Dei filium, ejusque

equis justitiam propriam iustitiam constitueret, sed tamen iustiti per fidem renunciabant sua
pristinae spe et hanc fuitarem amplectentur amicti hoc uno gloriose, instrumento.

Hac Bisbus est pura et splendida; Puræ ratione iustificationis, quia sicut nos coram Deo in culpatos et
irreprehensibiles, immunes omnis labis et macule; Splendida respectu gloria, tum apud Deum qui
propter hanc puritatem in suo filio nos heredes constituit aeterni sui regni tum apud homines quibus a-
doptionem nostram splendidissimis suis fructibus indicat, &c.

To them (the church of the Jews) which before lay filthily, na-
med, in rags, linnen clothes are given to cover her deformed
nakednes, this linnen is Jesus Christ made ours for righteousness
and salvation by imputation, whicoh garment the Jewes wanted,
whilst refusing the sonne of God and his righteousness, they inde-
voured to establish their owne, but being infest by faith; they shall
renounce their owne old hope, and shal imbrace this saving one,
being arrayed with this one glorious garment. This linnen is
pure and shining pure in regard of Iustification, because it pre-
senteth us before God unblamable and unreprovable, without any
spot or wrinkle, shining in respect of glory as well with God,
who for this holynes in his Son, hath constituted us heires of his
Eternall Kingdome, as also with men to which hee sheweth our
adoption with it's shining fruits.

The place more clearly and fully expresseth the Pro-
testant sense, who take righteousness for good works;
as Beza, which yet he calleth, *viva fides, vita ipsa in locum.*

The R hemits acknowledg, that when wee say, *bona o-
pera* meant, that they are the fruits and effects of Faith,
and of the justice wee have by onely faith, *Remist. in lo-
cum.* Which they denying Doctor Falke replyeth.
*This Text compared with Rev. 7. 14. sheweth whence the
beauty of this garment commeth, verily not of the justice of men
but of the blood of the Lamb, and the merit of his Sacrifice, ib.*
If you say that's not the active obedience, you must hold
your peace, seeing that maketh the other *meritorios*, and
is an *essential* requisite thereof confessedly.

Who also addeth in truth at these *Iustifications* (good
workes) are the effect of one *Iustification* which is by faith, one-
ly in the merits of Christ, ib.

^f Linnen are the righteousness of the Saints, not from them
selves or what floweth from what is inward, but is cleaveth from
V v 2

f Mr. Brightm.
after on these
words. Bisbus enim
iustificationes
sunt sanctorum
non ex leipsis aut
rebus iustiti ma-
nata, sed foris ha-
ret in externa
veste, nimis
Christo quem per
unam fidem in-
duimus, and then,
Nulla similitudo
dilectionis ante o-
culos ponit im-
putariensem iusti-
tia per fidem,
quam hac vestis
tam crebro in-
Scripturis usur-
pata.

without, in our outward garment, Christ where we pass answere by faith: No similitude doth more closely put the imputation of righteousness by Faith, then this of a garment so often used in the Scriptures.

And on the 3.c. v. 4. to the Pa. gifts, he faith, Sed meminerint hoc meritum tri- boni vesti non corpori. id est imputationi justitiae Christi ita tanquam ve- ste induimur. Righteou-

Places of the New Testament.
3. Romin. 21, 22. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested being witnessed by the law and prophets even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe.

They say is here meant the righteousness or active obedience of Christ, who is God imputed to all that believe.

When as this place is urged by ours against Pontificians, &c. by righteousness, none meane the active obedience of Christ excluding the Passive, they speake of both, you Answer.

1. This text is fully opened, Trec. 1. c. 4. and sheweth to speak plainly for the imputation of faith, no wayes for the imputation of the righteousness of Christ.

Let the Reader judge, and to that end look so farre backe and he shall find, that argument satisfied.

And in this text faith is not mentioned as righteousness, but what is distinct from it, that righteousness is by the faith of Jesus Christ.

2. Some by the righteousness of God understand Gods faithfulness in keeping promises as Ambrose.

On examination before our learned have found it otherwise, and the scope of the Apostle sheweth it.

3. By the righteousness of God is doubtlesse meant that that wch god may or meane which God himselfe hath found us to justify or make men righteous. Of which, c. 3. S. 2. p. 40. Or that very righteousness by which we stand justified or righteous in the sight of God, neither have I found any that understands it of the righteousness of Christ.

The method and meanes God hath found, and is revealed

vealed is Christ and his righteousness, to prove which and helpe you, you may meet with both out of *Parsons*, and *Calvin* on the place, see before.

Let Beza be consulted with, what may bee understood by the word righteousness, forsooth that perfect and highest integrity of his humane nature, with which every one is endowed (it is given to those that believe in him) who is endowed according to his humilitie with this integrity most absolutely, for our sake as shall be declared afterwards. He is presented before God holy unblameable and unreprovable. That therefore is said by St Paul; the righteousness of God not onely because it is the free gift of God, &c.

*Quid vocabule
Iustitia Dei in-
telligatur, per-
fecta nimis illa
et summa integri-
tatis humanae
naturae quia quis
quis donatus est
(donatur autem
credentibus in
eum) qui hanc inse-
gnitatem secun-
dum carnem
absolutissime -*

prudens est, non stri causa ut postea declarabitur, sistunt coram deo *ay. os aqua* *s. xij. 20. 21. 22. 23.*
ut loquuntur Paulus, 1 Cor. 22. Ea igitur a Paulo dicitur iustitia Dei non modo quia gratia uitium Dei est
donum &c. in 1 Rom. 17.

*Id est quia ha-
betur Christo vel
qua Christo
naturam. Hoc
naturam. Hoc
enim addendum
fuit ne quiesce-
re istimater fidei
esse illud quod
justificat, quoniam
sit duarum in-
strumentum quo
Christum iustici-
am nostram ap-
prehendimus.*

Beza on the text those wordes, of Jesus Christ.

That which is given to Christ, or which resteth on Christ for this was to bee added lest any one shoulde think faith to be that which justifieth, when as it is onely the instrument by which wee apprehend Christ our righteousness.

Read the passages out of *Calvin* and it shall be evicted that the man that met not with Christs righteousness was either willingly blind or negligent.

3. Rom. ult. The last ver. of the 3. Rom. is laid bold on us a favourer of their imputation.

It's not ours but the Lerd's: Let imputations be layd on it, as that it's ours. it doth but conforme them who do so to that brood of Papists with whom they have this in common, that they cannot endure the word, as elsewhere hath been obserued. The words are, *Do we make void the Law through faith? God forbid! yea we estab-
lish the Law.* You say,

*They conceive that the Law cannot be said to be established by
faith or by the doctrine of faith, but onely by imputation of
Christs fulfilling of it.*

We say the Law is established by faith, when as it is said to justify us, it doth it by application of Christs

perfect obedience to the Law, active and passive imputed unto us. What say you against it?

1. That there's no necessity that in this place should be meant precisely the Moral Law, Calvin understands it of the Morall and Ceremoniall, &c. therefore he is far from conceiving, that the imputation of Christ's righteousness should be established by Pauls affirming the Law to be established by faith.

Let it be understood of both, the Morall Laws establishment cannot be denied to be by faith, nor that of the imputation of Christ's obedience, by that establishment, but confirmed also. *Calvin* telleth you, *When we come unto Christ, in him is found the exact righteousness of the Law, which also by imputation is made ours.* The righteousness of faith is the exact righteousness or obedience to the Law, which is by imputation made ours.

I see not what this is to prejudice our doctrine, or to what it tendeth.

2. You say it's more probable that Paul here asserteth the establishment of the Ceremoniall Law, &c.

To what end is this? I know not truely, and therefore will passe it. It establisheth both.

3. When you say there's no necessity that the Morall Law should be established by the imputation of Jesus Christ.

1. I answer that cannot be excluded. See *Calvin*, see also *Pareus*, who answer that other objection, that faith establisheth the Law in sanctification, which none deny. *Calvin* and *Pareus* oppose not these, but establish both.

2. As for what you object fourthly, I include in the obedience by faith in which I hold justification: those 2 make but one consideration, and they are not to be separated. *Firstly*, Your last concept croseth all before, so that here's no answer to the objection of the enemies of Christ and the Apostle who thought them enemies to the Law, and their doctrine, *Mat. 3. & Acts 15.* which yet is layd down to be the scope of the Apostle, both by *Calvin* and *Pareus* in the place.

See Chemnit. ex-
am. p. 332. de
Injij.

This hath been an unpleasant digression, how that text and for what it's urged you may better consider, where we urge it to shew that righteousness by which we are justified must be an exact conformity to the Law. For which see places urged from interpreters.

Rom. 4. 6. *To whom the Lord imputeth righteousness.*
That righteousness can be no other then but the righteousness
of Christ. To this you answer,

1. This is fully opened in mine answer to Mr. Walker, p. 41. whither the Reader is desired to repair for answer. I desire it also, for mine answer thereto, he shall find it full.

2. That the Apostle rather requires a righteousness suitable to every mans condition, then that of Christ, which hath no such property already, presented in this discourse, there shalst thou finde it examined also, c. 2. sect. 5. p. 7.

3. That righteousness which God is said to impute, is placed by the best Expositors in remission of sinnes. so Paræus.

Of him we have seen before, in our Defence of Mr. Walker, and in this place he calleth righteousness and sin immediate contraries, in which the consequence is necessary from position of one to the position of the other, and contrarily, where there is sinne there righteousness is not, where sinnes is not there is righteousness, therefore the Apostle rightly, blessed are they to whom the Lord imputeth not sinne, therefore they are blessed to whom he imputeth righteousness.

ubi non peccatum ibi justitia; recte igitur Apostolus, *beati quibus Deus non imputat peccatorum;* ergo beatis quibus imputat justitiam.

It followeth not therefore there's no imputation of righteousness. But *contra ergo imputat justitiam.* Paræus, in Rom. 4. 7. Thus that great engine doth batter your own Bullwarke. Paræus in the same place urgeth, as observable.

Observe, 1. in this 6. ver. imputed righteousness expressly to be taught: God imputeth righteousness, therefore there is imputed righteousness: Let the Sophisters tear this as they please they shall never take it from us.

Contra immediata, in quibus necessaria est consequentia à negatione unus ad positionem alterius et contra: ubi peccatum, ibi non est justitia;

Observa 1. hoc versu. 6. expresse doceri justitiam imputatam, Deus imputat justitiam ergo est justitia imputata. Hunc igitur lacerant Sophisti ut velin in manuqnam nobis extinxerent

There-

Therefore expositors exclude not, nor can imputation of righteousness as we have seen, and with *Pavam* his leave, that righteousness is subjectively in Christ, as others shew, and that out of the Apostle, 2 Corin. 5.

4. *To impute finne signifieth, either to looke upon a person as justly liable to punishment, or to inflict punishment for finne: the latter I finde most frequent, either to hold a man liable to punishment, for finne or to execute punishment; then to impute righteousness imponeth to looke upon a man as a righteous person, and to invest him with those priviledges.*

To impute finne infoldeth a man a sinner and guilty of death and Gods chargeing it on his score, and an holding him so, so long, whether hee shew it in punishment or not, punishment may be deferred, God may after that inflict it, but is an infallible consequent except man repent and God forgive.

Not to impute finne is not onely not to punish, but not to hold guilty, and so to forgive, which God doth not where a man continueth a sinner, *God shoulde hold the guilty innocent*, acquit a wicked man. He is therefore supposed just and righteous when as the Lord doth so, and that by the righteousness of Christ applied to him, by righteousness imputed: the imputing therefore of finne, or charging it on a mans score, denyeth imputation or application of that righteousness, the not imputation thereof putteth the imputation of righteousness *ex concessis of Pavam*, and Gods laying it to our account.

As therefore punishment is a consequent of sin, &c. God chargeing it upon a man, so the priviledges of a justified person the consequents of righteousness imputed to that man.

In the former God is a just judge, *the just judgement of God is, that they that doe those things shoulde die*; mans sin and perdition are of himselfe. In the latter righteousness is by

by the free grace of God, yet declaring himselfe just in Justification through the blood of Christ applied by Faith, which also makes further differences, destroying your conclusion. But to the last,

Ult. Here is neither peere nor preepe, of the least ground or reason to conceive that by righteousness should be meant the righteousness of Christ.

A righteousnesse is necessary as hath bee shewed in defence of Mr. Walker, and that ther's no other to bee found, by which it may be done amongst the sons of men.

Let that place be consulted with, and you shall find it cleared, and that by the interpretation of Protestant Divines, *Parsons, Ames, Whitaker, &c* Let the judicious reader both read and judge.

The next place you mention is.

Rom. 5.19. For as by one mans disobedience many are made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many bee made righteous.

Hence you say we argue.

That as by the imputation of Adams disobedience men are made formally sinners, in like manner by the imputation of Christs righteousness men are made formally righteous.

For your formally. I find it not in any of our Divines from this place, when as they urge it against the Papists; for to prove wee are justified by the imputation of Christs righteousness, if you make use of these words, therefore you shall but vainly jangle, our sense hath bin sufficiently expressed before.

Doctor Downham may bee feene, l. 5. c. 2. Sect. 1. See Mr. Perk Refor. casb. and Abbot defence. p. 404. Doctor Ames Bell. Enerv. Towl. 4. p. 144. Its a place vrged by all Protestants against Papists, to prove the imputation of the righteousness of Christ.

To this you answser.

1. Somewhat hath bee spoken of the sense of his Scripture and the inconcludency of this argument, Par. 1. c. 21. Sect. 2, 3. where that may be also found, examined.

2. It is not said here by imputation of Adams sinnes men are formally sinners, but sinners, that is, obnoxious to death and damnation, or sinners by propagation, so that heres neither little nor much for imputation.

1. Formally taken for inherently we meane not.

2. When as they are said obnoxious to damnation; they are not denied sinners as hath been shewed. If the sinne it self had not bin imputed, then as *Bellarmino* himselfe somewhere argues; neither the guilt nor the corruption, saith, Doctor *Downham* (I may of the rest of the punishment) had not belonged unto us.

And hec addeth which hath beeene observed before that.

Things that are transient when they are once past and gone, cannot be otherwise communicated than by imputation. ubi supra p. 272.

When as you say, or by propagation not imputation.

1. None question but we are formally sinners by propagation; corruption of nature is spirituall death wherein we are conceived and borne, the deprivation of Gods Image, and depravation of nature are what wee have by propagation, which argueth the cause our sin in *Adams*.

When as you deny imputation, and not by propagation, you runne into the Pelagian Heresie, as *Vossius* before, where he sheweth the contrary the Orthodox doctrine. You joyn with the Papist, of whom yet many are against you and *Bellarmino* himself against himself as Dr. *Downh.* sheweth l.4 c. 10. Sect. 3. and Sc. 4. and Dr *Abbot* against Bishop: all ours hold as inquisition of nature by propagation to imputation of *Adams* sinne, whence guilt and punishment. He not wast time in numbring them, hearken to your master, he is amongst the Prophets here.

We affirme Adams sinne is imputed us to our justification, to Wot. in Defence Mr. Perk. p. 178.

3. Neither doth the Apostle compare one act with another, but the satisfaction with the provocation and remedy with the disease, after-

therwise he shalld make sins of omission to be no disobedience, because they are no acts, in which yet also Adams sin stood.

The comparison is betwenee disobedience and obedience, disobedience infoldeth his omission & commission: Christ's obedience the perfect remedy, but what's this against the imputation of it?

4. By the obedience of Christ whereby its here said, many are or shall bee made righteous, wee cannot understand that the righteousness of Christ, which con fifts onely in his obedience to the morall Law, but that satisfactory Righteousnes which he performed to that peculiar law of mediation, which was imposed on him, and which chiefly consisteth in his sufferings, see c. 3. of this part, Sect. 4. p. 45.

The most interpreters compare this with 2. Phil. 8. where it's said he humbled himselfe and became obedient unto death.

5. None of our's meant by the obedience of Christ that which consists onely to the morall law, they infold his Passive obedience.

2. You do not well in opposing that obedience to the Law, to what's mediatory. I have shewed he obeyed not that law for himselfe but us and your selfe hold it an essentiall requisite to the Passive obedience, where you have considered of this you must seeke for satisfaction.

3. When this is compared with that 2. Phi. in that you shall find not onely Christ's death and sufferings, but his incarnation with all that ever he did and suffered even till death, his whole doings and sufferings becomming man was his poverty, not for himselfe but us: neither is there here an exclusion of his Active obedience.

When as you object, out of Paræus (*as you say*) if by the obedience of Christ we understand, Universalem ejus conformitatem cum lege. 1. The Antisubstis will not stand, betwenee the disobedience of Adam, and the obedience of Christ, Adams disobedience being but a particular transgression.

I Answer, 1. when we understand his universall obedience to the law, it was but our debt, wee exclude not

Christs sufferings, which *Paracæs* calleth satisfaction to the Law.

But to the opposition, *Adams* sin is called disobedience, and *Christs* righteousness obedience; the one was universall obedience you say, and was not *Adams* universall disobedience to the whole law? Yes, but this is a lesser reason, there is a greater.

The effect, righteous making hath beene hitherto ascribed to his blood.

We establish that the other cannot in your judgement be excluded, seeing it's essentiall, neither is blood sufficient without that which is absolutely necessary, nay essentiaall.

3. Suppose that contrary to Scriptures and generall currentes of Interpreters; we understand that active obedience be performed to the Law, yet will it not follow from hence therefore man must be made righteous by imputation, for the righteous making here is the same with that, ver. 16, 17, 18. now that righteousness as he calls it, ver. 17. is described to be the gift, forgiveness of many offences, and that cannot stand in the imputation, of an observation of the Law.

It's a weary taske to run over and over the same things which yet I must doe if I examine you, the Reader may see I do but follow you. let it be mine Apologie.

1. It's not contrary to Scriptures, and as for the generall current, the man cannot blush that denyleth we have many for us against one that opposeth.

2. Righteous making in one and other place are the same, here more fully delivered to be by Christs obedience, nothing but righteousness can make righteous, and no righteousness but Christs; remission is a consequent as hath been shewed that which supposeth imputation of righteousness passive all confess, but you, &c. and you hold that active obedience to be a necessary, nay *essentiall requisite* to that and *meritorious*, how anothers righteousness can be ours, but by imputation we know not.

6. Lastly,

16. Lastly, It is loose arguing from a thing done in a determinate manner, as Peter was slaine with death, therefore, by a beast or with a Dagger, so from this that we are made righteous by Christ's disobedience to this determinate manner by Imputation; there being other manners of righteousness making.

This arguing is not loose, an others sin or righteousness can be no other waies ours but by imputation, being transient as we have shewed: I cannot be a sinner or righteous by the same otherwise, which yet the Apostle afferteth: righteousness of Christ active or passive will not doe it unless it be applied, imputed by God.

Imputation of sinne is read in the same Chapter. v. 13. and so is unpitation of righteousness twice in the former, but it seemes it will not stand with your imputation of faith in a proper sense.

Another text is Rom. 8. 4. *that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us.*

Say you,

It's argued that the righteousness of the Law can in no sense be said to be fulfilled in us but onely by the righteousness of Christ or obedience to the Law imputed.

I answer, this text is usually urged for our justification against Romanists, but that it should be onely Christ fulfilling of the Law excluding his passive obedience, I know none that afferteth it, but this is your common practise in laying down our arguments to intimate to the world your opposition against men that are onely for the imputation of Christ's active obedience.

You tell us,

1. Some Learned and Orthodox understand it of sanctification rather then justification.

I answer, the scope sheweth the contrary which is to prove though there be corruption in Gods people, yet no condemnation to them that are in Jesus Christ: these words shew what the Law could not do God sent his Son, &c.

that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, see D. *Dowubam*, l. 7. *de iustif.* c. 7. *scit.* 10. 11. *Mosculus* and your selfe are rather otherwise [huc omnes proprudent quos viderim Papistæ] *Sed nostra causa, &c.* Cham. l. 11. c. 7. scit. 18. 19. Neither doth one or an others opposition hinder, but the strength and reason of it.

And here will I cite some of many, who plainly interpret it that way.

Our Homily amongst other texts, mentioneth this, whence as it taketh notice, 1 of Gods mercy, so 2. of Christis justice: *upon Christis part justice, that is the satisfaction of Gods justice, or the price of our redemption by the offering of his body and shedding of his blood, with fulfilling of the Law perfectly and broughly.* — *It consisteth in paying our ransom, and fulfilling of the Law.* — *whereby our ransom might be fully payd, the Law fulfilled, and his justice fully satisfied.* So that Christ is now the righteousness of all them that do truly believe in him, before them paid the ransome by his death before them fulfilled the Law in his life, so that now in him and by him every true Christian may be called a fulfiller of the Law, *forasmuch as that which their infirmitie lacked Christis justice hath supplied.* 1. par. *Serm. Salvation.*

It's a manifest allusion to this place, and these contain the Doctrine of the Church of England about this busynesse. Let *Berze* follow.

A. x. 1. ap. 2. Illud ipsum nimurum quod requirit Lex ut ex ejus prescripto justi et integri coram deo censemur. Nam cum ad peccatorum remissionem et impletionem iustitiae accessit etiam hoc tertium, id est, perfecta naturæ nostræ integritas (quæ omnia gratis consequimur in Christo per fidem apprehenso) ut in omnes facies se convertat Sathan justi sumus coram deo etiam ex illa absolutissima legis formula quam obrem etiam dixit Apostolus supra se legem non evertere sed stabilire.

In nobis, non dicit Apostolus a nobis. Neque enim idcirco in nobis nulla est condemnatio quod iustitia sit in nobis inchoata: sed quia in Christo sumus in quo plene

plene sumus sanctificati. &c.

Bullinger. Ex loco infert, secundum posterius sequitur ex priori, nempe cum lex nos nec vivificare potuit, neque nos praefare potuimus, quod lex requirit a nobis. Deus qui Dives est misericordia, et bonitate filium suum misit in mundum ut hic incaranretur, moretetur pro nobis atque ita peccatum imperfectionis nostræ tolleret, et perfectionem suam nobis conferret in fide; quæ est perfectio et plenitudo legis. Constat ergo ex his Christum implevit Legem et hunc esse perfectiōnem in orbe omnium. *Dor. 3. Serm. 8. p. 137. 1.*

Deinde implevit legem Dominus quia voluntati Dei ab solutissime per omnia satis fecit, cum sit ipse sanctum sanctorum in quo nulla est macula. concupiscentia prava nulla, peccatum nullum. In eo, est dilectio Dei perfectissima, et justitia per omnia absolutissima, et hanc nobis imperfectissimis communicat gratis, si credamus condonat enim nobis peccata factus pro nobis expiatio et communicat nobis suam justitiam quæ imputativa vocatur.

Aretius. hoc *discrepans* prorsus fuit complendum etiam in nobis ideoque Christus induens nostram carnem, nostro nomine perfecte prestitit Legem, *Marth. 5. non veni &c.* — pertinet hoc membrum ad beneficij Christi applicationem ad nos ad *Rom. 8. 4.*

*See Clemens de
just. p. 255.*

Chamier. Sed nostris tamen magis placet *discrepans* intelligi jus Legis duobus comprehensum capitibus: uno penas decernente aduersus peccatores, altero etiam sic plenam obedientiam exigente, nec aliter quenquam absolvente. Quorum neutrum nos in hac carne peccati poteramus praefare, itaque nihil erat certus aeterna damnatione. Sed providit Deus, et dedit Mediatorem a quo utrumque impletum est; et quidem pro nobis: nam et penas dedit violatæ legis, et legem tamen plene implevit. Utrumque illud cum sit pro nobis non habet amplius quod a nobis requirat, itaque jam pro certo nulla damnatio est ijs qui sunt in Christo. *I. 22. 2. 7. Sect. 29.*

The-

The justification of the Law is fulfilled in us or by us, because the righteousness of Christ through faith is so reckoned unto us as if we our selves had done it, &c.
Carto. Annot. in Loc.

Dr. *Davenant*, answering *Bell.* citing this text thus, *Respondeo ad primum Locum : et si nos non implemus Legem, tamen justitia Legis impletur in nobis qui interimur in Christum; primum, quia Christus satisfecit Legi, pro omnibus membris suis, patiendo mortem carnis; secundo quia illorum nomine exacte ad minimum usque apicem totam legem implevit, &c.* c. 52. de *actuali infinita*, p. 562.

Idem Deus suo decreto (quia homo per peccatum infirmatus fuit) transtulit legis impletionem in christum. *Barthol.* atque voluit ut illa obedientia et justitia quam christus in carne nostra praestaret per imputationem nostra fieret. Ergo, &c.

Probatur, ex *Rom.* 34. Sensus loci hic est : Christum a patre misum renatos omnes et sibi infitos, a damnatoria vi legis et peccati exemisse, poenam nostro nomine sustinendo ; quam nos sustinere non potuimus, legem nostro nomine implendo cum nos implere non potuimus ; atque sic nos in christo reputamur totum jus Legis impleuisse, quia et perpepsi sumus propter peccata nostra poenam quam lex intentat, et praetitimus simul exactam illam obedientiam quam ipsa effla gitat. c. 28. *arg.* 4. p. 365.

Ergo hoc ad veniam referre necesse est : quia dum nobis accepta fertur Christi obedientia, Legid factum est, ut pro justis senseamur — sed quia suam justitiam nullis communicat christus nisi, &c. *Calvin in locum.*

Ibi non aliud Complementum designat quam quod Imputatione consequimur. *Calv. infra l. 3. c. 11. p. 23. ad locum, & Rom. 8. 3.*

Eo enim jure communicat nobiscum Dominus christus suam justitiam ut mirabili quedam modo quantum pertinet ad Dei judicium, vim ejus in nos trans fundat.

Aliud

Aliud non sensisse abunde liquet, ex altera sententia, quam paulo ante posuerat quemadmodum per unius obedientiam constituti sumus peccatores ita per obedientiam unius iustificari: quid aliud est in Christi obedientia collocare nostram iustitiam nisi asserere eo solo nos haberi justos, quia Christi obedientia nobis accepta fertur ac si nostra esset. &c. vise.

Paraw in locum Altera causa finalis liberationis nostrae per Christum tuit, ut jus Legis impleretur in nobis hoc est ut maledictioni Legis maledicta morte crucis Christi latiftheret, eaque satisfactio nobis imputaretur non secus acsi a nobis impleta fuisset. Impletur in nobis dum nobis imputatur per fidem, hoc est acceptatur a deo quasi per nos praestita dum propter eum nos a peccatis justificat. Observe his phrases and imputation.

I have been too large enough, if not too much of conscience to shew our sense by Interpreters. Let us now consider what is opposed.

2. It cannot be means of active obedience imputed, because it must be such a righteousness and fulfilling which may be apprehended a proper effect of Christ's condemning sinne in the flesh, ver. 3. The latter is intended a fruit of the former; now Christ's active obedience or imputation of it cannot be that effect, condemning sinne is by death, and he that hath the guilt of his sinne taken away by death needs no other righteousness or imputation whatsoever; as Conclus 1. & 4. 2. cap. of this Treatise.

Beza sheweth the preposition την (a) can by no reason admit this interpretation, neither doth the Apostle now speake of the death of Christ, and the expiation of our sinnes, but of his Incarnation and the corruption of our nature abolished thereby, and he giveth (b) condemned, (c) Abolished, as you, and shewes how it doth come to passe for sinne is accounted nothing though the reliques thereof remaine in us, by Christ's righteousness imputed unto us.

2. Suppose it of forgivenesse of sinne by death, you cannot exclude imputation, nor imputation of the active

(a) Nulla ratio ne potest hanc interpretationem admittere; neq; nunc Apostolus agn de morte Christi et nostro rum peccatorum expiatione, sed de Christi incarnatione et natura nostra corrupti onem percam abe lita, &c. See the place.

(b) Condemnavit
(c) Abolevit.

Nam impu tata nobis Christi iustificatione peccatum pro nihilo habetur, quam vis super fuit tali quia ejus in nobis.

active obedience of Christ, Christs death not imputed doth not do away guilt, and Christs active obedience is an *essential requisite* as you lay to that. Let us intreat you then that both may be imputed; what you say is examined.

3. *But it must be the end of condemning sinne in the flesh.*
No, but an other end of sending Christ, &c. one was for sinne, the other was that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, that by the enured death of the croſſe satisfaction might be made to the curse of the Law, and that satisfaction imputed to us, as if it had been fulfilled by us. — It is fulfilled in us whilst it is imputed unto us.

By the sufferings of Christ *Paracæl* meaneth his whole poverty, obcearence from his Incarnation to his death, from which Christs active obedience to the Law cannot be excluded, it was part of his subjection and humiliation, and as for you, your grant that its an *essential requisite* to what is Mediatorie will stop your mouth.

3. *Its an unquicke expression in them*, for it denotes subjective subjection or some kind of efficiency; friends of imputation affirme Christs righteousness subjectively in him, in us by imputation, not by way of efficiency, for they are not works, therefore an imputed righteousness cannot in any tolerable construction be said to be fulfilled in men.

1. *Inuir your selfe* (p. 14. in 7.) give us the cleare meaning of the place: *in us or upon us*, made good and fully manifested in us or upon us, viz. in our *Justification*.

In which ſenſe their's neither subjective inheſion of the righteousness of the Law nor efficiency.

2. When as it's ſaid to be [*in uero*] we deny it [*a nobis*] in that name with Beza, and may oppole with him.

Sed quia in Christo sumus in quo sumus plene sanctificati, nam quod de imputata Christi sanctificatione dicimus ita accipendum est ut sciamus non in circa ipsa.
But because wee are in Christ, in whom wee are fully sanctified, for that which we speake of the imputed holynesse of Christ, is so to be understand that we may know that wee are not therfore accounted holy before the Lord, because the integrity of the man Christ, doth preece out what is wanting to ours, but because he hath wholly sanctified us in himselfe for ever.

It is fulfilled in us whilst it is imputed by faith: that is, it is accepted of God as done by us, whilst for it bee justifieth us from our fauer.

4. *If compleat obedience which every believer according to the great variety of their severall calling: and condicions, &c. stand bound to performe: it's not trueth us fullfilled in them, by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, scarce a believer but stands bound to particular acts not found in the workes of righteousness performed by Christ.*

Its strange when as he fullfilled all righteousness, but of that see the place, and the next argument taken from it's superabundance, &c.

5. *Sicut uia translated righteousness signifieth not conformaty with the Law; but that justification which was the end and intent of the Law, &c.*

sanctos coram
Deo haberi quod
Christi homini-
nis integras fa-
ciat quod nostra
debet sed quod ille
nos in solidum
sanctificavit in
se in eternum.

Impletur in
nobis dum nobis
imputatur per ho-
dem; hoc est ac-
ceptatio a Deo
quasi per nos
præstata dum
properemus nos
a peccatis iustificati
cum.

And yet you see they hold and gather the imputation of Christ's righteousness, that contention about the word will not sted you.

6. *Neither must we of necessity and withall precise our understand the morall law, and that is cauus be meant precisely of the morall law is evident:*

1. *Peter Martin hath these words, I say these words cannot be expounded of the Ceremoniall law.*

Ita in qua-
verba non pos-
sunt exponi de
lege ceremonia-
rum, loci Com. ad
jusit. S. 2. 20.

And the concupiscence he comforteth himself against is undeniably in the morall law, and that was it which had the promise of life.

1. *To your Arguments, I know not that the Ceremoniall Law or judiciall were impossible, burghensome it may be; or if, ther's no comparison between them for impossibility, with the morall. The wisedome of the flesh, is not subiect to the Law of God nor can be, not to that law.*

2. *Its false that they built so much on those as these; And if it were granted the morall law cannot bee excluded from man.*

When as you say.

4. *The morall law suppose it had not beeene weake by the flesh, could not by exact obseruation have justified Jewes who were bound*

bound to the observation of the other two, and had beene found
faine s.

But you must consider both these were added be-
cause of that weaknes; and suppose it, which destroyeth
your supposition.

And when you say.

*It's evident that by the righteousness of the law in this place,
the Apostle meaneth such a law which of it self was able to justi-
fie man; it met with strength in men answerable to it, and there-
fore it cannot bee meant here determinately of the morall Law
which hath no such ability in respect of the Jewes.*

You see not how you destroy your owne assertion, for
the morall law was able but on our weaknes disinable :
It had that ability to whole mankind, the man that did
it should live: of whatever Nation or condition.

As for your determinately and precisely I have no skill
in them. (if they pleasure you ought) I know not
who against you wileth them.

4. *Lastly, because Jewes had bin never the neuer justification
by the righteousness of the law imputed from Christ, being under
the transgression of other lawes.*

Christ fullfilled all righteousness, which imputed is as
large as they need, and how it can follow that the mo-
rall Law is not meant, were ther's a fulfilling all righte-
ousnes, or a righteousness imputed, which is the fulfilling
of all righteousness, I conceive not.

7. *The cleare meaning of the place seemes to be this, that that
justification or way of making men righteous which Moses wri-
tings, held forth, by faith in the Messiah to come, to bee made
good or fully manifested upon us, who walke not, &c. giving e-
vidence the great justifier of Men, MOSES foretold is
come, &c.*

1. *This interpretation is confirmed by the sweet agreement it
hath with such a fulfilling of the Law in those that believe and
live accordingly, and the sending of the Messias, as in the
former, &c.*

What truth soever there be in that, that, what Moses
prophesied.

prophesied of is fullfilled in such, as believe; and that ther's an agreement, as in the reason. Yet it's not the scope of the place, which hath been shewed.

Besides that interpretation wee give of imputation of the righteouhess of Christ agreeth both which *Moses* and *David*, as the Apostle sheweth. It's a fullfilling of what *Moses* spake: *in thy seed shall all the Nations of the earth be blessed*, and with Gods sending of the Messias which was *to make an end of sins and to bring in everlasting righteousness*, of which *Daniel*, &c.

The sense of fullfilled is not lost in our exposition. *Calvin* found it when he said, *whenas Christ's obedience to the law is given to us, satisfaction is made to the law, that we may bee accounted in it.*

He designeth no other fullfilling to us, then that whiche we attaine by imputation.

See before, and Paræus; surely, when as Christ came to fullfill it he did so, and it is fullfilled in us when as it is applyed. As if we had done it.

3. You say questionleffe, righteousness here is the same with that Rom. 3. 21. witnessed by the law and the Prophets, and established, ver. 31.

Of the text *Rom. 3. 31.* enough hath beeene spoken twice before, and also the 21. vers. Thither I send the Reader that I may spare often doing over the same. See *Calvin* on both places.

And to your fourth, I grant *this place agrees with that*, *Rom. 3. 21, 22. 25. &c.* But deny in either, that the righteousness of God, that is, the way or means, God uteth for Justification stands in remission of finnes, only seeing it must needs be by righteousness and seeing remission of finnes is a consequent of Justification, it cannot be a way and meane of God unto it.

And Secondly, I deny that it can well bee called the righteousness of the Law.

Thirdly, though it was not so fully revealed in the Law and Prophets, as after Christs incarnation and death.

Dum nobis ac-
cepta fertur
Christi obediens-
tia legi facisfa-
cium est, ut pro
justis cencia-
mur, in hoc.

And when he
suffit, non aliud
complementum
designat quam
quod imputatione
conspicitur.

Inpletur in no-
bis quando appli-
catur.

death, yet Christ was a Lambe slaine from the beginning of the World, and so finne was condemned in the flesh of Christ, the vertue of it had the same effect, but this last is not to our busynesse.

The next Text which commeth to your understanding used from this cause is.

9. Rom. 31, 32. But Israel which followed after the Law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness, wherefore? because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the Law.

That is, had the Jewes who followed after the law of righteouinesse believed in Christ, they had attained the Law of righteousness, that is, should have had the righteousnesse of the Law performed by Christ imputed to them.

Had the Jewes who sought after righteousnesse and Justification by the works of the law, by their obedience to the Law of God, beleeved in Jelus Christ for righteousnesse and Justification they had attained righteousnesse and Justification, God had imputed it, they had received it and bin justified by it. But they knew not this righteousnesse of God, they submitted not to it, they rejected Christ and it, and would bee justified by performancee of the Law, and so mist it.

1. It's said e. 10. 3. they knew not Gods righteousnesse, that which he revealeth in the Gospell, Christ our righteousnesse, or his righteousnesse, the righteousnesse of GOD our Saviour, 1 Pet. 1. They went about to establish their owne righteousnesse: inherent; that which was not, or short of what God required to that end. they submised not to it, they would not imbrace it by faith.

They would be justified by there owne workers, not another.

They ignorantly and proudly contemned it, &c. The Gentiles obtained righteousnesse, 9. c. ver. 10. as a gift given by God, received b. faith as an hand See Paræus in the Margent.

Let us now examine your answer You say,

1. By the Law of righteousnesse they sought after but could not

*Noluerunt eam amplecti, Tamen
nolentes ejus iustitiae subiit; hoc
est sive amplecti.*

*Ignorantia et
superbia quadam
iustitiam Dei in
Christo oblatam
contemnunt et
abiciunt, con-
temnunt finem
legis qui est
Christus. Ignor-
ant quam in
Christo sive con-
sequamur, Tamen
sive, 4.*

Obtinuerunt s.

not attaine, so we meant the morall Law: or any Law properly so called, morall, ceremoniall or judiciall, but as other *Justification* or *righteousnesse*, as in answer; the fift.

1. I anwere, Justification and righteousness really differ as cause and effect, and may not be confounded: You might more properly say *righteousnesse* to *Justification*.

2. This they sought but attained not, because they sought it by the workes of the law, that is by obedience to the law not onely the morall but ceremoniall law.

3. When you lay God had given them those laws.

I Anwer none urge the seeking of the Law, as not having them; but the Law as a meanes of righteousness to life. When you adde,

Their study to keepe the law, could not be a cause of comming short of righteousness.

I answer yes, when as they did it to attaine righteousness to Justification; It was a Pharisaicall practise; condemned by Christ and his Apostles; holy obedience to the commandements, for ends required by God is on thing, for righteousness and Justification, is condemned because it's impossible, and for many reasons else.

2. To the second answer I reply, we meane righteousness.

3. As *Calvin* and *Musculus*, neither doe we restraine this to the Morall law, and this satisfieth the 3 also.

4. Neither could either doe them good, supposing their attainment, being sinners, though it be impossible which is all I will say to the 3.

5. Your fift is granted it was righteousness to justification as before. They sought it then by the workes of the law, and could not attaine it, it was not the course or meanes of God. There is another way then which the Gentiles walking in obtained perfect righteousness, by, and for Justification, that is, the righteousness of Christ given us by God, applyed by faith.

The next Place is.

de in Christum vebam
RETE. 4. 3.
innuit, justitiam
ut donum a Deo;
offerit: fide ut
manu a nobis ac-
cepit, ut si pta, c.
3. verf. 17. Fides
apprehendit justi-
tiam gratia im-
putata. Item
apprehendit et
fide accipientes
remissionem pec-
atorum et do-
num justitiae in
Christo. there
Offerit. 5. Aliud
sic fides at uid fide
justitia etiam
est ex fide, fides
est organum acci-
pientis justitiam.
Justitia ex fide est
imputata. Chanc.
de justif. c. 3. S. 2.
25. 839.

10. Rom. 4. For Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth.

Therefore (say the masters of that way of imputation, which we desire to hedge up with thornes.) the righteousness of CHRIST or the obedience performed by him, to the moral Law is that which is imputed to those that doe believe for their righteousness.

Let the Reader peruse, that which was taken out of

*Quod præter justitiam operum suis
justitia alia, quæ
est fidei seu
Christi.*

Paræus, it serveth to lead us to the opening this place. That which they (seeking righteousness by the law, establishing their owne,) were ignorant of, and submitted not to was the righteousness of faith, the righteousness which faith receiveth and God imputeth, to here the Apostle sheweth.

Solus Christus
eam prestat ad
justitiam cuivis
credenti. At jus-
titia fidei impu-
tatur, *dubiorum*
en plic. p. 796. 5.

Paræus (having shewed that the law was given to give life) and the impossibility of attaining it but by coming to Christ, not by the laws fault but want of obedience in us not able to obey it.) he saith, *only Christ performeth it to righteousness to every one that believeth.*

Diximus alibi,
quomodo Dei
justitiam fidei in-
duant homine.

quia scilicet imputatur illis Christi justitia. *C. lvi. in loc.*

Ab ipso uno (Christo) justitiam gratuitam peramus. *See Toffan id ib.*

Postquam tamen omnes in reatum conjectur novam substituit in Christo justitiam, quæ operum meritis non acquiritur, sed gratis donata fide recipitur; *id ib.*

Bona showing that the attaining the end of the law, not hindered by any quality of the Law, but the vice of our flesh addeth. Cui deum ita medetur Christus ut in eo uno gratis per fidem nobis imputato finem legis confiteamur, et illum justificati qui pro nobis legem implevit, pronobis maledictiones omnes in se recipit, et in quem pro nobis omnes benedictiones sunt effusa ut heret nobis justitia sanctificatio, &c quam obrem etiam Apostolus dixit supra, 3. 31. Se per fidem non tollere legem sed stabilitate in loc.

Paulum opinor non modo legem a Christo impletam dicere sed de hujus impletionis efficacia nobis videlicet per imputationem justificari. *id ib.*

Intelligunt (locus) de veritate et perfecta justitia quam in Christo gratis imputato consequimur.

Paræus having spoken of those texts. Rom. 1. 17. 3. 21. and 10. Rom. 3. *satis*, perpetuo intelligit eam justitiam, quam Deus peccatori credenti donat, non per infusionem sed per imputationem interprete Apostolo, Rom. 4. 6. 11. *C. lxiij. p. 22. seqq. 497. of the same.*

Dr. Davenant urgeth this text in the place before p. 365. 10. Rom. 3. 24. Hic finis de quo loquitur Apostolus est primaria legis intentio, id est ut homine non justificetur et ad vitam perdatur per ejusdem oblationem, quia autem nolito vice oportet contrarium potius in nobis, efficit; succurrat Christus et sua obedientia omnium credentium nomine propter primaria finem legis implet; hoc est justificat suos et ad eternam vitam perducit, *ib. ibi he urgeth against Tapiss.*

For the justice of God in the verse. (10. ROM. 3.) verse. 4. is put the perfect fulfilling of the Law by Christ which u every ones righteousness which doth believe. Cartw, annoe. in Rheims.

You place urged by our Homily, and what is gathered thereon that of Rom. 3. 3. wee have heard Dr. Downham urgeth, *I. 1. c. 2. seq. 9.*

Let us now examine your answers.

1. That *meant* of Reason that by Law in this place should be meant the righteousness of the Morall Law precisely and discerningly.

That the Morall Law is meant is enough, I know none exclude the Ceremoniall Law, and that will be speciall, being *eterna lex et eterna obligatio[n]is*, as your selfe.

2. Its not true that the righteousness of Christ imputed to believers (supposing such imputation) should be called the end of the Morall Law, for nothing can bee properly said thereof of a thing, but only that which is reason may be obtained by it; there's an utter impossibility that Justification by Christ should be obtained by the Morall Law: obedience had no excellency, so such a selfe, it may more reasonably be said the end of the Ceremoniall Law, as typifying Christ and his blood, nor as a Law, which was to expire on Christ's coming.

The text is, *Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness, to every man that believeth*; what man shall in vain looke for by the works of the Law, by faith in Christ he may obtaine on that ground.

Justification might be obtained by the Law, the fault was not in the Law, but our selves, as the Apostle and Expositors: thence impossibility as before. We urge not that justification by Christ should be obtained by the Morall Law, but faith apprehending the righteousness of Christ, and yet the Morall Law accidentally (as Mr. Galt.) leadeth to Christ, and instructeth, as your selfe in sh. Christ is the complement of both for righteousness, the perfection of them.

3. That which you give the minds of the Greek Authors, that Christ exhibited or bewitnessthat which the Law propounded to us false, his condition, viz. *Justification*. Is what say. (if you adde righteousness) as the text, and Christ selfe come to Justification, without righteousness ther's no Justification.

4. The 4. your selfe reject.

5. Is because by his incarnation and death hee put an end to the Mosaicall dispensation; you say its untrue but no true expostion.

1. Its no truth, *de ceremoniis verum, de morali non item,* so *Pavans* of it. It standeth not with what hee delivered. c. 3. ult. *per doctrinam fidei Legem habiliti.* So *Tosanus* to that place.

2. Its no true interpretation as *Tosanus, ibid.* from the scope.

6. *The plaine meaning seemes to be this, that the Law (meaning the whole Mosaicall dispensation, was given to the Jewes by God for this end, that it might instruct them of the Messiah to come to die for them, that so they might believe in him accordingly, and be justified: and further to prepare them for the Messiah himselfe and perfect service of God which hee should bring with him.*

1. If this be Gods aime in the whole *Mosaicall dispensation*, its of that part the Morall Law, and how is there then an utter impossibillity that justification by *merit* should be procured or attained by the Morall Law? *sect. 19. secondly, the hole was given by God to them (as you) for this end that it might instruct them of the Messias, that so they might believe and be justified.* I know not but these are inconsistent.

2. Whenas Mr. *Gataker* rather inclineth that Christ was the end of the Law, t r that reaon simply, *quia lex revera populo Debet esse quae a missam viam premissurum, quod erat ministerij Messiae praeceps viuere.*

Though there be a truth in it, that the Law instructeth and leadeth to Christ Ceremoniall yea and Moral, as Mr. *Gataker* (which latter I know not how it will consist with your opinion in point of preparation and yet you must hold it because it's the office of the whole)

1. Yet that's confessed accidentall.

2. There'

2. There's an other given by *Gomarus*, with us.

*Finis Vov. ac
complementum*

(ut Chrysostomo placet) aut causam ejus gratia Lex est, designat, nempe obedienciam perfectam, quae cum nobis natura debet, solum vero Christo adserit ea nostra sit perfida, ut justi sumus et ius vita eterna viciemus.

It's true, it's called strained but without reason given, *Interpretationem
Chrysostomianam* to omit that it's the common tenet, and Mr. *Gataker* *ego quidem non
illibenter admis-
serim: Christum* faith,

Legi complementum dici qui Legi ambris violare plenissimam pro nobis satisfactionem exhibendo eam q. am coniunctissime implevit. (quo modo et illud accipio quod ad Rom. 3. 31. de lege per do-
ct. iam Evangelicam habilita dicatur.)

3. Chiefly and properly.

*Per se et maxime
proprie / faith*

Paratus noting that you give accidentally Christus est finis Legis hoc est complementum, et perfectio quia Legis impletio in Iolo & Christo est et habetur si ut dicit ipse, non vnde legi solvere sed implete implevit. *Motalem Conformatum nature et vita quam solus ipse habuit et habet.* Satisfact. one pro maledictione et pro peccatis nostris per humilitatem et mortem. Et perte finis legis fuit, justificatio nostra quia pre-
dicti perfectam beatitudinem ex hanc praestantibus promisit vitam. *Paratus.*

Neither doth Mr. *Gataker* deny this *legis finem per se.*

4. I demand why *finis per accidens* shall exclude that which is *per se?* and for the scope its proper, the question is how the Gentiles obtained righteousness, how the Jewes mist it, these sought it by the works of the Law, they knew not Gods righteousness, submitted not to it, Christ in quo solo legis, impletio est et habetur, who therefore is the perfection of it, and this is that of faith, and that righteousness of faith is imputed (as *Paratus* else where) and when he demandeth *ad quid?* he answereth, *ad justitiam* out of the text and,

mit fibi; et at enim in se ipse justitia eterna Alijs igitur est finis Legis, ad justitiam, hoc est justitia non merita, quibus vero? nisi vis credentis. Lex hunc habet finem in facientes legem et justitiam, et facientes justitiam, et facientes faibz Toffauz, Illum finem assequuntur et iulus Christus et nos alleluia dum fidem apprehendimus; Ita in Christo exhibetur et praestatur vera justitia quam lex requirit modo in-
sumus; et edamus. Offeratur quidem justitia omnibus donatur cum em- et imp. natura solis creditibus.

*Justitia re a nou-
tiis per im-
pletionem Legis,
& legis impletio
non est nisi in
Christo. Neque
is justitiam me-*

*rit nisi in
justitia non
merita, quibus
vero? nisi vis
credentis. Lex
hunc habet finem
in facientes
legem et justitiam
et facientes
justitiam, et
facientes
faibz Toffauz,
Illum finem
assequuntur
et iulus
Christus et
nos alleluia
dum fidem
apprehendimus;
Ita in
Christo
exhibetur
et praestatur
vera
justitia
quam lex
requirit modo
insumus;
et edamus.
Offeratur
quidem
justitia
omnibus
donatur
cum em-
et imp. natura
solis
creditibus.*

Grant the Law now by accident leading to Christ, yet in Christ the complement and perfect fulfilling of the Law, *is it and is to be had, est et habetur.* It's to righteousness, which is not without fulfilling the Law, and it's all one in Christ merited for them that believe, given to them that believe and imputed.

Christ's conformity and humility, was nothing else

but perfect fulfilling, his whole poverty consisted in thicke, and is our riches.

The text would be granted if no more were urged then Christ's sufferings and passive obedience, but you that hold the other an essentiall requisite to the efficacy of that passive obedience, cannot exclude it, and this text is evident for full obedience to the Law.

But Ile retorne to you. You confirme what you say,

1. *By the tenor of the context, for his meaning is doubletse Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness by the observation whereof as their own, they sought to be justified, which was as well of the Ceremoniall as the Morall.*

This excludeth not the Morall Law, nor that in Christ is the perfect fulfilling of it to righteousness, and so justification of believers.

2. Neither yet, that the Ceremoniall Law was a Scoolemaster to Christ. 1. *Seeing thereby unquestionably is meant the whole frame of body or the administration of Moses, as your selfe in the same place, and by this you oppose your selfe to Mr. Gassaker, who is onely for the Ceremoniall Law, which yet concerned not every belieuer* (which is the Apostles here) *but Jewes, and so long the words had a truthe before it, and will have eternally, so that the maine scope is that the onely way to finde righteousness to justification is by knowledge of Christ and submission to Christ the righteousness of God: Faith in Christ is the way of obtaining righteousness before God, and that because he is the Complement of the Law to that end, in eo quod habet ut; Let me be found not having mine own but that which is by the faith of Christ, the righteousness of God, which is so per imputationem as Paulus out of the Apostle, c. 4. ver. 6. & 11. of which before.*

The next text is,

2 Cor. 1. 30. *But ye are of him in Christ Jesus, who of God is made to us wisdom and righteousness, &c.*

Because Christ is said to be made to us of God righteousness

teousness therefore the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us.

Here is less colour for the deemed imputation, than in any of the former Scriptures.

Let us a little view Interpreters, for by them you did propose to give us satisfaction.

Your adversaries as you call them, who suppose and propose strength in this place for the imputation of Christ's righteousness to us, are all Protestants that I know, not one excepted.

To satisfie your Hearers and Readers I will enquire a little into Expositors.

Calvin. Quo intelligit nos ejus nomine accepto: esse deo quia morte sua peccata nostra expiatum, et ejus obedientia nobis in justitiam imputatur, nam cum fidei justitia in peccatorum remissione et gratia excepimus confessus, utrumque per Christum consequimur. In *Lectio;* secundum tractus Aug. 16. p. 52. &c.

Paul Sandys, pro imputata Christi justitia, against *Ramsey*, was vindicated in *the Confutation of Bellarmine*.

Parvus bringeris in te forme thus, Justitia nostra seu ac his donata iustificamus. Nulla ergo nisi Christi justitia nobis per fidem imputata, est nostra coram Deo justitia. Nulla igitur alia nisi Christi justitia nobis imputata, coram Deo iustificamur. See him large. See what's mentioned on, p. 3. Sec. 6. before, for both these places give hand in hand.

Dr. Ainsl. p. 244. and *Chambers* fol. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, & 24. Justitia & Deo nobis facta est quia in to sole iusti habemur, reputamus illius meritum iusti. *Ainsl.* In Loc.

Trotter, in *Lov.* Sic justitia nostra per sanguinem ad Rom. 3. Et quidem iustitia non ex parte sed tota nostra iustitia, per remissionem peccatorum et imputationem totius suae iustitiae, sic *Ier.* 33. p. 29. ad *Locum.*

Seeing we shall do difficulties to obtain righteousness for us of the Lord. Christ was givene by the Lord who performed perfect obedience to the Law, that by his obedience we might be made righteous, for the obedience of Christ imputed to us and apprehended by faith, is the righteousness of ours. 5. 16. 19. &c. placed in Christ, with a mediator as of God's will, Righteousness, 1 Cor. 30. &c. And that is our righteousness Christ himself, who righteousness and Lancency being ascribed to us, doth bring about remission of sinnes and true righteousness, Dr. Whitaker p. 239, 250. in *Camp.* & *Dunc.* *Paul affirms* Christ to be made unto us, *ibid.*

*See John, Crotin, another Trotter, 1 Cor. 1. 30. & 13 Ver. 6. Si Christus nobis factus est iustitia ergo non ipsi nobis sed sumus iusti per imputationem *Ibid.* De iustitia imputata, 391. See his *Confutatio* 5. & *replies* of *Bellar.* and *Be. Anat.**

Norivius & *papaline* *Christus* est nostra iustitia; et Christi justitia est nostra iustitia, *Christus* enim nec quis est persona nec ratione quarum vis aliam perficiat, est nostra iustitia, sed ratione obedientia scripturariorum, si ratione effectum et *ex auctoritate*, Christus sane non potest esse nostra iustitia, quia iustitia iustitia nostra sit iustitia, p. 39, 394. ubi omnibus clementer, 397. and *Dr. Downham* *the* *Justit.* 1. 4. c. 9. Sect. 3. &c.

Let us now heare you.

1. *Christ is no otherwise affirmed to be, or to be made Righteousness to us when his done or sanctification, therefore he's no more ground to conclude hence imputation of Christ's righteousness.*

onfusse for our righteousness, then of his wisdom &c. This is unsavory : This speciall manner cannot bee made good hence. The meaning is he is made the Author or sole meane by way of merit, purchased for us by his death.

1. As I finde this Text urged by Protestants for Imputation, so I finde in Papists this objection. Because maketh it, to whom Job, Grocius and Chamire give a particular answer.

2. Though there be granted someting generall wherein Christ is said to be all thole, it followeth not but there are speciaill differences.

*Aliter, faith
Chamire, san-
ctificatio aliter
justitia nimurum
vel inherenter
vel imputative.*

Et hoc quidem tanto certius quanto distinctius posita justitia et sanctificatio; nam justitia inheret eadem est sanctificatio quia utraque inhabitu utraque in operibus justitiae eo ipso quod iusta sunt, sed sancta, scilicet 20. & scilicet 23., unde si therefore the Apostle shall twice say the same, regungenda est a sanctificatione iustitia, et quia sanctificatio est iustitia inheret, acciendenda iustitia pro ea, quia non imputativa dicimus. Et hoc.

Paratus giveth it to the Apostle out of Rom. 4. 6. & 11. as before. He sheweth the same out of Bernard. *Cronus* answereth more largely to the same purpose, and citeth Fathers for it, sect. 44. and 46. proving the same. p. 397.

And though this manner cannot be made good hence in the word and phrase, yet you see ther's a necessity of distinction ; and whenas the Scripture saith, *thac by his obedience we are constituted righteous*, and sheweth the way *imputation of righteousness*, Rom. 4. 6. 11. we may well supposse it, and thereby put a difference.

3. To the second part of your answer, it being made by the same Jesuite, *Chamire* answereth, granting his merit and extending it to justification by imputed righteousness, aswell as to our inherent sanctification.

For the reasons you give :

1. *The word righteousness is frequently put for justification.*

You must remember that is by a metonymy, for its
the

*Item non ne-
gimus, effectiva-
factum meritoris
sapientiam justi-
tiam sanctifica-
tionem, redempti-
onem, certe enim
ille meritum est a
deo qui videlicet
aut habere possu-
mus, sed nimirum
meritum ut et
inherentem san-
ctificemur et im-
putariemus justifi-
camur, &c. c. 17.
scilicet 23.*

the cause, justification the effect; and if hee be made justification hee must be made righteousness to that end. cause and effect put each other.

2. *That righteousness is still given to the death of Christ, and never to his active obedience.*

It's righteousness aswell as passive obedience, and due on our behalfe to God by his eternally obliging Law.

We exclude not Christs death.

What you lay down is the question and is no stronger then your proofes.

And its wonder to me how you can exclude it who make it essentially requisite to the meritoriousnesse of his sufferings, and therie not to be separated, as before.

3. We profess both active and passive. It's not therefore against the principles of themselves, none hould it of his active obedience onely, that ever I read of, but the man of clouts your selfe put up and shooote at in this busynesse.

4. *Expositors are for this. Who by Christs being made righteousness unto us, understand our justification or just making by him: some placing it in Remission, some ascribing it to his sufferings, none to his active obedience or imputation of this to us.*

1. What Expositors have done we have given a taste, and 2. Ther's none that take it for active obedience alone and imputation thereof excluding Christs passive obedience. 3. Many joyne the active and passive both, all that I know, either directly as those you o pole, or in effect; whence they make hat which indeed was active also as Christs whole humiliation our obedience as *Prem.* An' as for imputation I know no enemies it hath but *Socinus, Arminius* and Mr. *Watson* (Mr. *Gataker* disclaimeth it: So doth *Piscator*, *Justitia*. 1. cuius satisfactione nobis donata atque imputata justi sumus. M ton. eff. Et. 1. sec. i. l. c. 1. and *Prem.*) and Papists: and yet the evidence of truth is such as from this place where

where he answereth also he yeedeth what we desire : and Imputation as the Mar^t. of Controversies observed to us, and is to be seen. 2 de j^{ustif}. c. 10. sect. d^{ecima} : and that out of *Bernard*.

So such as place justification in remission of sinnes which supposeth righteouſneſſe and that of Christ and that imputed or applied to that end, it being an effect or consequent, as Mr. *Gataker* himſelfe, and ours at large before ſhewed.

And it's but your presumption to think that on your Popiſh objection anſwered before you made it, which you will not take notice of, that Imputation of Christs active obedience will not more be urged, or contended for from hence.

The next is. 2 Cor. 5 ult.

For he bath made him to be ſinne for us, who knew not ſinne, that we might be made the righteousneſſe of God in him.

As our ſinne are imputed to Christ, ſo Christ's righteousneſſe meaning his active obedience, is imputed to us. Mr. Gataker bath well obſerved, this place is pregnant againſt themſelves.

Let us a little view Expositors on the Text, and ſee whether there be a man opposite to the imputation of Christs righteousneſſe, I will ſay active and paſſive from this text.

B. Dicit loco, quod est in Calvin and others : hinc enim serui dicimus. Ut non iusti mentis ipsa iustitia dei quae eft in Christo, ſicut ipſe dicitur peccatum, id eft peccator, per peccata quæcumq[ue] in actuq[ue] ut enim imputantur illi peccata nostra, int̄ imputatur nobis iustitia illiarum.

Calvin in loc. Iustitia hic non pro qualitate aut habitu fed pro imputatione accipimus, conquid accepit nobis fertur Christi iustitia, neq[ue] ad amittere redam iustitia et peccati. Quoniam iusti sumus coram deo : qualiter te. Christus fuit peccator. Perfonam enim noſtam que dammodo ſuſcepimus nos noster nomine fieret, et tanquam peccator judicaretur non proprijs ſed alienis delictis. — Iaſey nunc iusti sumus in ipso non enia operibus proprijs ſatisfacieamus iudicio Dei ſed quantum conſervat Christi iustitia, quam fide inducimus ut noſtra fiat, in loco eis l. 2. Inſtit. c. 16. ſect. 6.

Nam filius dei omni virto purissimum iniquitatum tamen noſtrorum probrovoꝝ ignorantiam inducit, ac ſua vice ſem puritate nos opernit.

Vides non in nobis ſed in Christo eſſe iustitiam noſtram, nobis tantum eo jure competere quia Christi ſumus particeps, ſi quidem omnes eius diuitias cum ipso. pollicidemus, in loco Inſtit. l. 3. c. 18. ſect. 29.

Sic Becc. in loc. Iustitia dei ad eis iusti aſud deo et quidam iustitia, non nobis inherenter sed quia cum in Christo fit nobis per fidemꝝ deo imputatur, id enim addidimus eis? a 27. a 27. Sic ergo ſumus iustitia Dei in ipso ut ille eft peccator in nobis, tempe ex imputatione, whereto feruimus horum Christi eſſe made ſinne.

Parow Coſfig. l. 2. c. 18. p. 509. Propofitio noſtra eft manifesta, &c. et assumptione pacis. Chancier. of the place, in quo magnum pondus, quia non tantum nos dicimus facti iustitia, ſed etiam Christus.

Christus factus peccatum, unde illuc vix liberatus Apollonius.

Argvmt anticr. c. 41. de just. c. 12. 2d & 18. Apk ergo peccatum ut nos iustitia nec soft in sed De bonis non in nobis. sed in spiritu, sicut ipse peccatum non finit, sed nostrum non in spiritu in nobis.

Sed contra hoc unde evidetur. Christi iustitiam dicit softissima per imputationem habentur, 2 Cor. 5. ad Dr. Davenant c. 28. p. 367. Vtrumque hoc loco habentur et Christi imputationem quod nostrum fuit et ab aliis vicinum imputationem quod Christifum.

Si Dr. Davenant l. 5. c. 1. Sct. 4, 5. scz.

Et Dr. Lck. Gerius ubi supra. dig. 8. Sct. 47. 197.

Anglus Bell. Exercit. 1616. against Bishop. Dr. Whitlocke, ubi supra.

Adversus in locum ut nos efficeremus iustitiam Dei, hoc est iusti pronuntiaremur; imputativa iustitiae tanquam verba orationem.

In ipso significatur enim Christus nullum esse iustitiam quae nos peccatum eraret et que valeret in consueta de. sc. 11.

Totam ut nos efficeremus; hoc est iustificari non iustitia inherenter, sed in se propter unionem cum illo et imputationem ejus iustitiae, in hoc.

Then although we be in our felice adoptione full and unrighteous, yet even that man that is impious in benefits, full of iniquity, full of sinnes can bring frownd in Christ, the. putteth away his frowns by not imputing, taketh quite away the punishment thererore due by pardoning it and accepteth him in Iesu Christ as perfectly righteous, as if he had fulfilled all the whole law. I must take heed what I say.

But the Apostle teach God made him to be figure who knew no sinne, the. such as are in the sight of God the father, at the very frame of God himselfe.

Let it be considered fully to forgive, whereforever it is our comfort and our confidence, we care for no knowledge in the world but this, that man hath sinned and God hath suffered, that God hath made himselfe the friend of man, and that man are made the righteousness of God, act. Hooker on Hils. n. 4. p. 3.

But you must be heard.

1. There is no footing in the scripture for the inference drawn from us, her's nothing of imputation of our sinnes to Christ or his imputation of righteousness to us, Christ being made from imputatio ne soft imputation, &c.

We deny it, let's see whole reasons are best

2. Dr. Davenant, saith that's not the same power of imputing unrighteousness, to make Christ unrighteous, which is of his righteousness to make those that believe righteous, see more Sect. 39. p. 26.

You heard the Doctors Argument. I spare more but remit you to what's answered to that named place.

3. There's not so much as the face of comparison, betweene Christ's being made sinne for us, and our being made the righteousness of God but the latter is affirmed as the effect, end, and consequent of the former.

1. Ther's an agreement, as hec was wee are and both no other way then by imputation. Weston def. Perk. p. 173. And Dr. Abbott. p. 400. who maintaineth the comparison against Bishop. when Bishop denied comparison: Mr. ~~answ~~ answere there is some comparison

son or likeness implied by the Apostles.

2. Grant this the effect the former the cause the former cannot be, nor cause this effect without imputation. Nor yet the latter without application, imputation of the same.

3. Thirdly, in him must import faith and Gods imputation, thence participation of his righteousness, not in our selves but another, him, which can no otherwise be as you are often answered.

4. The cleare meaning is, that God for that end made Christ sin, that is, a sacrifice for sin; that we may be made, &c. This is a society or remnant of righteousness, after the peculiar manner of Justification or righteous making, which God hath contrived through the sacrifice and offering of his Sonne.

This is but a generall, and it's taken up by parts after, to which we will give particular answser.

1. It's a frequent expresse to call the sacrifice for sinne by the name of sinne simply.

It's granted and yet the same tell you, that interpretation, a sacrifice for sinne, is short, and that hee was made sinne, without which he could not be a sacrifice; not by inherence but imputation.

Bona tamen ratio Antithesis pos. ut potius Christus dicatur factus esse peccatum pro nobis si. peccator non in se, sed ex omnini nolitrum peccatorum reatu ipsi impunitato, e. hujus rei figura fuit hircus ille geminu. e. ius hi mentio Lev. c. 16. Beza in loc. m.

So Doctor Downham. If God did make Christ a sacrifice for sinne he imputed ours sinnes unto him, &c. neither can it bee conceived how he should be made a sacrifice for our sinne, unless our sinne were imputed unto him. Who sheweth the agreement between the types and Christ, p 267. 268. See Mr. Wotton defenc. Perkins. the place may be expounded otherwise, hee made him to bee counted a sinner, &c. Thomas and Catherine & p. 190 of Defenc, our sinnes were charged to him as like sins of the people were in a type laid on the scape goat, Lev. 26. 21. It's Mr Perkins argument, Dr. Abbot defendeth it largely, p. 204.

Et si patres non nulli peccatum intelligant hostiam peccati tamen utique sensus stare potest quasi am utroque modo. Christus factus est peccatum pro nobis, tum quia peccata nostra ultra in te derivavit gloriam da, luenda, tum quia vicima factus pro illis revera luit.

Prius tamen sensus haec dubio est ve ior, et Chrysostomo placuit, &c. he was debitor coram Deo, quid sit autem debitor coram Deo nisi peccator cum debita sibi sum nisi peccata.

Parinacastig. l. 2. c. 10. p. 510. Thus Parinus to Bellarmine objecting as you.
de C. rocam p. 401. and p. 406. who prevent it from the type, 16. Lev. Audit illi imponi peccata por-
 pulicorum portare peccata, unde polluebat et hincus ipsi et polluebat alio, ut et causa sit quod absolutione
 indulgerit, qui ipsum tetigeret ver. 34. and 16. Ann. t'ipam. fuisse Christi non dubitate vere Christiani
 tunc hanc imputationem peccatorum a Christo et versus ceremonias sunt inanitas, quippe cui non re-
 spondet: veritas, &c. 407.

2. To express a number or company of justified ones Sect. 3.

P. 45.

There it's examined.

3. Of that from the righteousnesses of God, we have spoken, it's
 of Gods donation and contrivement, Land of God, that person as
 before.

4. The effect is means, deliverance from the guilt and pu-
 nishment of sin: nor imputation of his active obediency.

If the effect bee meant , it followeth not that the
 righteousnesses of Christ expresed shall be excluded , im-
 putation of righteousnesses, the passive none exclude, and
 you cannot the active if it be an essentiaill requisite to
 the passive remission followeth justification or just mak-
 ing(as you speak) a man cannot bee made just but by
 righteousness.

Your fixt is but an affirmation of expositors, without
 places the contrary is largely shewed. I suppose.

*One Scripture more, whence the argument being more ridicu-
 lous, it shall be insisted on with more brevity.*

You are a merry man that can laugh at Arguments
 brought from Gods word, all are ridiculous, this more
 with you , you laugh at all Protestant Divines, and
 truth it selfe, God may laugh at you in agone when you
 shall stand and be found not in Christ's righteousness, but,
 a weake faith.

3. Gal. 10. For its written cursed is every one that abideth
 not in all things which are written in the booke of the Law, and
 doesthem.

The argument is given in thus.

*If every one be cursed that abideth not, &c. then can no man
 be justified but remains accursed, who hath not the perfect obe-
 diency of Christ to the law imputed to him, because no man can
 obtaine*

obtains such personal observation thereof.

You lay, it deserves not an answer; and the man of the argument is confederate with Stapleton the Papist at least in part: who maintains against Calvin, that the righteousness of the law and the righteousness of faith, are not two, but one and the same righteousness.

I know not the man of the argument, neither yet reason of your slighting him or it.

2. Confederacy with *Stapleton* is a great matter, It seemeth in the man of this argument. Your confederacie with them out of your owne mouth must bee acknowledged a great crime.

3. The righteousness of the Law, which Christ in our stead as our surety performed for us; Active and passive, which latter *Paratus* calleth obedience to the law, is all one with the righteousness of Faith, that which faith applyeth to our Justification.

Yet is he no confederate with *Stapleton*, seeing righteousness of the law with him is, that which is inherent in us. Which hath no agreement with us, but rather with you, who establish faith and that instead of that of the Law; and what is it but a part of inherent righteousness, required by the law? You call it righteousness on 3. Phil. 9.

But lets heare your answer.

1. If there be no other way to dissolve the curse but Christ's perfect fulfilling the law, woe a thousand times to the World: For 1. That ther's none such hath beeene proved. 2. If it were it would not dissolve the curse, it cannot doe but by the blood of Christ. He must be made a curse.

These are words, and so is your first Reason, and your second: For we exclude not Christ's blood, that's obedience as the Apostle and Paratus as before: and how can you exclude Christ's Active obedience, which you confess Essentiall to the blood to this effect dissolution of sin, that it may be a sacrifice?

2. He that is fully discharged of non-commission, is out of danger

danger of the curse': and w's insufficient with the opinion opposed to ascribe perfect forgiveness to the passive obedience, without imputation of the offence so that and that's spreading not so bring men of the curse has under the blessing, or promise doth this.

1. Christ's sufferings are not in themselves a full discharge, they must be imputed.

2. They must have *concurring as as essential requisite*, Christ's active obedience, if when they be imputed they take away the curse: did you never heare of this before and yet dispute it so often?

Your selfe confess, where ther's perfect forgiveneſſe, that man is perfectly righteous; I'll lay so too. That I require is that as you affirm it you shew us a caufe, and tell us wherewithall.

We can when as we name the imputation of both, as ther's righteousness given us there is a caufe.

And so when as you make the Active obedience an *essential requisite* to his sufferings, thers a caufe. You that deny it, deny the caufe. But as wee have shewed before the imputation of both must be supposed in the same; her's pardon, her's righteousness, her's no curse, her's a blessing and the caufes: your selfe deny Christ's death enough without that *essentiall requisite*: chew on this good Sir.

To omit that just making goeth before pardon as before: and the contrary were the abomination spoken of urged by our's so just, sic a wicked person.

3. *Imputation of a perfect fulfilling of the law from another cannot make him such, a continuuer in the law who breakes it daily and leaves him under the Curse.*

All the imputation in the world of what's ever from whom so ever cannot make him that hath not continued to have continuall sinnes.

This argument is a bloody and mercifull spirit bearing downe all before it to hell.

Imputation of Christ's Active and Passive obedience which is our Tenet, maketh him a continuuer in the

workes of the Law, notwithstanding the many things wherin all offend, in Gods account: thole that hold the imputation of the Palsive obedience alone doe so, or munt grant no man living in Gods account a perfect tulsifier of the Law, or perfectly righteous, which yet you argue for; for it taketh away finnes and that man is perfectly just as you teach.

Whenas therefore you say all the imputations under heaven, of whatsoeuer from whomsoever can not; you oppose imputation of an others righteouinesse or obedience simply, imputation of that which is palse of Christ also. And now let the Reader judge whose argument or tenet is a bloody one; for deny this imputation of Christs obedience, *ex concessis*, and all are as by nature, Children of wrath still, and under the curse. These are but words.

5. Ult. *The meaning is, every one that expecteth justification by the Law, the Curse will fall heavily upon him. It's to be limited to the universality of them onely who depend on the Law for justification.*

1. I grant that every one that expecteth justification by the Law is accursed, by this Scripture; but this answereth not the Argument, which is that therefore to avoyd that curse there must be perfect obedience imputed by which we must be perfectly righteous, and avoyd the curse, we must have it to avoyd the Curse, either our own or anothers, its impossible by our own obedience, we must have it by anothers, and that cannot be but by imputation, and so might passe the rest as not to the matter.

2. It's a truth of those, but it must not be limittted to them; if so, then onely justiciaries that looke to be justified by the Law perionally performed are under the curse, and not sinners simply (especially, which in the Church, and to under the Law) impenitent men though they hate that opinion are under the curse, b. that place of Scripture.

Your

Your first Reason.

1. What the Law speaketh, is speaketh to all that are under the Law, and no other, and those that expect it by faith are not under the Law, but under Grace, the curses concern them not, against such is no Law, &c.

1. This proveth not that those onely that will be justified by the Law, are under the curse; it's a truth of others who leake it not that way, being yet under the Law, as all are that are not under Grace.

No man denyeth what you say of the believer in Jesus Christ, neither doth it prove your restriction, or limitation: Faith in Christ, applieth the righteousness of Christ, of which before, By which we are justified, and have no condemnation, and it establisheth the Law.

2. Say you the context leadeth us to this limitation. 1. because the preceding words are, for as many as are of the works of the Law are under the Curse, for proofe of which he alreadgeth this text. 2. It's proved by the 9 ver. those that are of faith are blessed with Abraham: these, not those that would be justified by the Law, which he proves because they were under the Curse. So that continuall, &c. is onely required of those either to avoyd the Curse or obteine a blessing; who seek to be justified by the works of the Law, and not of those that believe and depend on Christ for justification.

I grant as before, justitiaries accursed, onely believers blessed:

And to the 3. the just to live by faith: Is the curse therefore limited to justitiaries? No, but it's true of other sinners simply.

When as you conclude,

Therefore that Justification which we have by faith in Christ cannot be said to be by a continuall in all things written in the Law to doe them, because it's nothing else but justification in seale by the Law.

1. What agreement there is betweene this conclusion
and

and what you tooke to prove, the limiting the curse to Justitiaries, I understand not.

2. I know none that defendeth that justification by faith is by our contintuance in the Law to do it. Its by the righteousnesse of Christ his active and passive obedience: his dying for us and fulfilling the Law for us, or death with his obedience that esentiall requisite, in our Doctrine apprehended by faith, imputed by God, by which we avoyd the curse, and enjoy the bleſſing, as before.

Sect. 29. *Whereas it may be objected, may not a man be justified by faith and that Law, and be intrusted to a righteousnesse of that Law by faith; you answer ver. 12. the Law is not of faith, he cannot fulfill the Law no man other by faith, it requires a personall observation, of which c. 8. I part. (and then is Law) that here's no Sanctuary for pretended impunitation, but an high hand of heaven to overthrew it.*

I need say no more then what I did immediatly before answere, we plead not for personall observation, more then you, yet observation by another we urge; that others pasive obedience with its esentiall requisite as you call it.

The former is not of faith, this is the righteousnesse of faith, and professe in these words of our Homily, *Christ is the righteousnesse of all them that believe in him, bee for them paid the Ransome by his death, bee for them fulfilled the Law in his life; so that now in him and by him every true Christian man may be called a fullfiller of the Law, forasmuch as that which our infirmitie lacked, Christ's righteousnesse supplied.*

As for the place you referre the Reader to, he may finde it examined.

Some plead, Phil. 3 9. but we having elsewhere upon a diligent search found this Scripture looking a quite contrary way, &c.

1. The *Some*, are all Protestants against Papists: 2. you found it not but indeavour'd to make it looke a cleane contrary way; but in vaine as on that place is shewed

shewed. See Zanchius on the place in the Margent.

And thus I have examined the Scriptures which you oppose. Let the Reader judge whether you are as good as your words and undertakings.

Argumentum against faith in a proper sense propounded and answered.

1. Arg. That which impeacheth the truth or justice of God, can have no agreement with the truth.

But the imputation of faith in the sense declared deth so.

Ergo.

The minor is proved, because if God should impute faith for righteousness he should account that to be so which is none.

The major is confessed an annoynted truth, the minor is denied, and to the proofe answer is made.

This was the plea of that fanatique Spirit Swinkfieldius as Zanchie: and the Councell of Trent as Calvin observeth, to prove that the word justification was not to be taken in a judiciall sense for absolution, but in a Phisicall or Morall sense for constituting or making a man properly and compleatly just, and is the common argument of Papists, for justification by inherent grace: yet I conceive it very unjust to charge either with Swinkfieldianisme or Popery.

The plea is good as it's made by us, and made good out of the Learned in our vindication of Mr. Walker, and that by our Orthodox Divines.

What *Swinkfieldius* held I cannot finde though I have sought, and cannot speake to it, it's not in that place of my Booke.

quatenus per fidem apprehenditur et nobis imputatur... Meritum aliena est iustitia et tantum nostra per imputationem non neque actione fidei nostra iustificamur; sed ea te tantum que per fidem apprehenditur, quia illi Christus cum sua obedientia iusti censetur, et sic illud intelligo credidit Abraham et imputatum est illi ad justitiam, Gen. 15. 6. quid reputum? non actio qua fed id quod credidit te ut alii loquuntur, ipsa fides non nisi apprehendat sed objecti apprehensi recipiat. Hoc vero est... Tunc Christi ipsius obedientia qua pro nobis et legem implevit et mortuus est. 3 Phil. et 5 Rom. per hanc enim iusti, constituantur multi credentes. Denique hac iustitia est Christus id ipse factus pro nobis, obediens usque ad mortem, 1 Cor. 1. & 3 Phil. hoc denum est illa iustitia de qua loquuntur Apostoli que sola fide percipiant, non est igitur nostra propria fide aliena non nisi ex illa habetur id que manu fidei. Q pare. Et nisi per iustitiam quae est in Christo justus esse nemo potest nestra sola imputatione non ut opus, &c. sed ut iustitiam Dei in se apprehensum habens iustificat, sicut oculum non ut aurum Sed vimur in se continens sumum existere. Capite 5, concludit sicut per in obedientiam Ad a nobis nimisimum imputata facti sumus omnes peccatores, sic per obedientiam Christi nempe pauciter imputata, nos qui in eum credimus justos constitui, &c. ubi testum profert, 9 Rom. 3. 24. in 10. Hinc sequitur ne; actione fidei nostra tanquam vel iustitia vel parte iustitiae non iustificari. In

In Christo non
pe infatu et in-
corporatus eo; si
habere non suam
propriam iustici-
am, quia videlicet
ex lege est, id est
operari, sed iustifi-
cium Christi que
per fidem habe-
tur. Hi exuti pro-
pria. Induuntur
iustitia aliena
hoc est Christi
qua vere iusti fa-
cti, &c. ibid. Sola
aliena vere, in
comspctu Dei
iustificari possu-
mus. Est una &
principius con-
troverbiis que
inter nos sunt et
Pontificis non
postrema.

In Christo est,
fide tantum a no-
bus apprehensio.
Opus habet.
Tunc perfecta
Christi iustitia
qua tan Juan ve-
ritate prestita illius
labes contagi-
tur iusta illud,
p. 12. beatiquo-
ram, &c. 1 p. 6.
Nempe Christi
imputata qua fo-
la vere in compre-
hensione Dei iusti re-
petantur.

Est nostra non av-
lia ratione nisi

For the Papist opinion of just making by inherent righteousness, and ours by what's imputed, they differ as 2 opposed opinions, the question is of that which constituteth a man properly and compleatly just: we deny inherent righteousness, by the same argument faith, these are incompleat and imperfect, ther's somewhat else that doth it, and ther's the perfect righteousness of Christ, here is a truth answering Gods account, see it at large before.

And methinks the word just making should not conforme us to them more then your selfe, who use the same often, as somewhere I have gathered and observed to you.

2. *As doth not follow God should account that for righteousness which is now — for faith is righteousness, in truth and propriety of speech.*

It's not perfect righteousness, and therefore it's not enough that it be righteousness, it must be perfect, what maketh a man so in the sight of God, if God should putre that which is imperfect for this righteousness, *Gods judgement shall not be according to truth.* It shall be but inherent righteousness if you stand to that and what the Papists urge. You say,

3. *This means not Gods accounting such an act, a righteous act, much less that he esteemeth it a perfolt observation of the Law. But that God looketh on a believer, and intends to do as graciously as it were with a man perfectly righteous.* Of this further, c. 19. 1 par. sect. 6. & 7.

1. I answer that which is imputed is not onely righteousness, but exact conformity to Gods Law, such doing such suffering.

2. I adde, When God looketh on a believer so, and dealeth so, it's not with respect to faith, but that perfect obodience of Christ, which faith apprehendeth, it's in his beloved, *in him I am well pleased,* faith is but the applying instrument.

3. That's not all, it constituteth righteous, *holie, unproveable*

provable, sub: amable, in Gods sight, a believer is so thought not inherently in and by the imputed righteousness of Christ, as Christ himselfe, because with his righteousness, which fai h in a proper seale doth not, and therfore.

4. Best writers say, God accounts men righteous or perfectly just, who have forgiuenesse of sinnes, and are not so in exactnesse of speech.

I grant it, we are not so in our selves, yet in exactnesse of speech are so in Christ: It's certaine from forgiuenesse of sinnes, which is a consequent of righteousness imputed, yea of Justification, those doe not exclude Christs righteousness, nor imputation: but suppose it, and so doth Mr. *Gataker*, of the passive obedience, and you must do so if you will not hold with *Socinus*, and if you hold the imputation thereof, what's essentially requisite, cannot be excluded.

But what's all this to your faiths imputation in a proper sense, all hold it relatively taking in the object, as before.

Object. 2. If faith in such a sense should be imputed for righteousness, then should justification be by works or somewhat in our selves: But the Scriptures reject Works and all things in our selves. Ergo You answer.

1. Either by works and somewhat else in our selves so means the merit of works, or else by way of simple performance. In the former the Proposition is false, and consequence denied, faith may be imputed in the declared sense, and yet not by merit: If in the latter sense so the minor is false, for the Scriptures rejecketh no where every thing that may go under the name of works, or that may be done by us from having to do in the matter of justification, God attributeth justification to faith which he calleth works, & Joh. this is the works, &c. some writers call *faith a worke*.

1. That you oppose is the imputation of Christs righteousness as the formall cause of justification; you deny Christs righteousness the materiall, and it imputeth the formall cause: You establish faith. Our argu-

ment is, if by faith, then by a work or somewhat in our selves ; when you deny the consequence, if it be taken by it's merit.

I answer, that which justifieth as matter or forme, must have worth and merit, so hath Christ's righteousness, and theretore we pick on it, otherwise it could not be the matter or formall cause though imputed, and we know works cannot merit, when all is done we are unprofitable servants : So your selfe, *1 Treas.* p. 191. And therefore also we may reject faith in a proper sense because it's not of worth and value, it cannot justifie formally. In the latter sense the Scripture rejecteth works yea faith as a worke as the matter or forme. *Paul will be found not having his own righteousness,* not faith, the place it hath is onely as an instrument, receiving that by which we are justified ; as an hand by which we receive riches by which we are rich, as a golden Cup, *Non us aurum sed viuum in se conservens sic sim extinguit,* as Mr. Zanchy but now, in regard of the object, that which is proper to the righteousness of Christ is given by you to faith, and it excludeth Christ as you defend it, the Argument is strong against you.

3. *Object.* Impputation of faith for righteousness in that sense makes justification net of Grace. To this you answer,

I deny the minor, there's an entire consistence between faith and Grace, *2 Ephes. 8. Rom. 3. 24.* it's purposly required, *4 Rom. 16.* It's free because nothing is required but a receiving, believing is nothing else but a receiving that righteousness be justification which God giveth us with his Sonne, *1 Joh. 12.* So that there's no prejudice to grace.

1. It's a good argument.

2. Though what you say be good and true of faith as an instrument receiving the righteousness or justification which God giveth by Christ his Son, in which speech the waight of justification is put on what is received, the righteousness of Gods Sonne, which is our

our expreſſure againſt Papifts, wherin Chrifts righteouſneſſe is alſo the matter and meritorious cauſe, and it's application or imputation the forme, where it's given faith as the instrumentall cauſe onely, but to the obiect to be that by which we are made just.

3. Yet this anſwer will not ſerve you, if you remember the queſtion; if you conſider faith is not in conjuſtition, but opposition to Chrifts righteouſneſſe, and in a proper ſenſe, that of an instrument is relative, and ſo is receiuing, you exclude Chrifts obedience, the obiect, deny a figurative ſenſe, thus I affirme it a worke, and righteouſneſſe in its ielſe, a mans own, I deny it, ſubordinate to grace or Chrift, but in opposition.

4. Argv. Faiths imputation for righteouſneſſe in this ſenſe is an occaſion of boating unto the flesh.

This you deny.

Because it's by Gods gift, 2 Eph. 8 it's what hee receiveth, and if why boasteſt thou thy ſelfe, no man hath just cauſe.

The minor is truth:

That's no cauſe of deniall because it is received, therefore it's not an occaſion to the flesh: It's true, ther's no true cauſe, yet the flesh will take it, and it's an occaſion given it. The Phariſe gloried in what he did, and looked to be justified by it, and yet he knew he received it, and therefore thanked God, they that urged works of righteouſneſſe with faith and Chrift and Grace, yet ſtill gloried. The Apostle therefore will be found *not having his own righteouſneſſe, and will have that of faith,* Chrifts; this excludeth boating not faith which is held all one with doe this, and which is ſet in opposition, as by you and not the righteouſneſſe of Chrift.

2. *Suppoſe the act of believing were from a mans ſelfe, yet he hath no cauſe of boating, because the weight of glory given it, and conſequents, are not given it for its worth, but by Gods good pleasure.*

As a man to whom a King for taking a pinne from his ſleeve ſhould be made honourable, and it were ridiculous bee ſhould bragge

bragge. This is the case of faith, though a believer hath given him forgivennesse, right and title to heaven, it's no ground of boasting.

When God chooseth weak and foolish things, occasion of boasting is put off, had men fulfilled the Law, there were cause, because they had done it out of themselves, abilities essentiaall to nature, which are not in faith, or the act of believing.

1. The act of believing is a mans own, when a man lives by faith its by his own faith, though God giveth him ability thereunto.

2. It's an act of obedience and righteousnesse as you say, and the Scripture faith, Paul would be found, *not having his own righteousnesse, and not of works of righteousnesse which we have done.*

3. Papists may answer so of charity, &c.

4. So long though there be not cause ther's occasion for the flesh, the flesh may, will and doth take it.

That it's not given for it's worth but Gods pleasure is not enough. Gods pleasure is onely in Christ, in whom onely is worth, which you exclude as an enemie to it, in the very question, *and not the righteousnesse of Christ:* had faith its place of an instrument (the good pleasure of God being in Christ): taking in the object it were somewhat: your proper sense indureth it not: The King that doth it for a pin, is not every way free, we deny a pins-worth in faith: a pins-worth and a pound-worth differ not in kind but degree: a faith in this similitude is worthy, though it be never so little.

Receiving, giving pardon and heaven to Gods Grace in and for Christ's righteousnesse are excluders of boasting, nothing that excludes that righteousnesse of Christ establisheth Free grace.

5. If faith in a proper sense be imputed for righteousnesse then are we justified by that which is imperfect, what needeth a justification.

You say, *you have met with such an one,* and answer,

1. The words import either we are justified without the con-

concourse of anything that is perfect, or that somewhat which is comparatively weak and imperfect, may sometimes execute, and contribute thereto.

In the former sense it is false, is doth not follow if faith be imputed, there's nothing perfect required, it supposeth more things than one, Christ's perfect attainment for some, which if it had not been there had been no place for the imputation of fault, &c. upon this it is that God imputeth our fault to us.

If faith be imputed, we are justified by that which is imperfect, is as cleere as the Sun.

When you say it opposeth Christ's attencement.

1. The effect you give it is not that by his sufferings imputed by God and applied by faith we should be justified, which is all one with our tenet, if it be taken with what you call an essentiale requisite, active obedience.

2. Nay you make Christ's merit to be faith's imputation which is the Socinian and Arminian tenet.

3. And do what you can it's but imperfect and cannot justifie otherwise then as an instrument applying the object, Christ's active and passive righteousness, to what followeth.

If in the latter sense, that somewhat that is weak and imperfect may sometimes concur and conduce to justification, so the proposition is granted and the minor goes to wreake, for that faith and the Minister by whom, are weak and imperfect, both which concur, ministerially and instrumentally we may be justified by what is weak.

Our question is about what we are formally just before God or justified, whether imputation of faith in a proper sense or the righteousness of Christ.

When we assert the latter to be that by which we are formally just before God, we deny it by faith in a proper sense: That which God imputeth to righteousness must be perfect, it cannot constitute us perfectly righteous, else, faith in a proper sense is imperfect therefore it cannot; take faith now for an instrument in a relative.

lative sense as we doe. It's true how weake soever, because it layeth hold of and applieth what is perfect, but in a proper sense, denying whats figurative and opposed to the imputation of Christ's righteousness, it cannot be so.

It's one thing to be ministeriall and instrumentall, an other to be the materiall and formall cause, so much as you take from perfection of those yea from merit and worth, so much you take from the perfection of our righteousness, no effect can exceed the cause of it.

6. Argu. *Some have opposed the imputation of faith we plead for*, seeing God should rather receive a righteousness from us then we from him. But in justification God receives not a righteousness from us, but we from him.

The major followes not, that God should receive from us or not we from God. 1. Because faith is not a righteousnesse properly, but that God by the meanes thereof, and tender of it looks on us as righteous, not as made meritoriously or formally righteous by it, but as having performed the condition to which the promise is made of making us righteous, meritoriously by the sufferings of his Sonne, and formally by remission.

Whose reason this is I know not. but if faith be imputed, &c. we receive not from God a righteousnesse, but God from us, by the tender thereof say you God lookes on us as righteous.

To the Reason. 1. Faith in a proper sense, is properly a righteousnesse, that which is called inherent. *It may both with truth and propriety of speech be called and counted a righteousnesse, yea the smalles degrie, so you, p. 176.* on tender of this that followeth, so that we still receive not.

2. That which is excluded is denied, that whereby we are formally justified, and therefore that which is asserted, faith in a proper sense should be by opposition the formall cause; that its a meanes in our sense is not questioned, and that which maketh us formally must be

be as righteousnesse so having worth.

3. Faith when as it's a condition is not to be understood in a proper sense and in opposition to the righteousnesse of Christ, but a relative sense taking that in, for that received and applied is the condition, and by it are we (as meritarius and formall) made just, that righteousnesse consisteth in the sufferings of Gods Son as you, not excluding Christs active obedience that essentiall requisite, to make it meritorious, thus it receiveth from the Lord, excluding this, it receiveth not but tendreth to him remission of sins is a consequent of justification, and therefore cannot be the formall cause.

2. If faith were righteousnesse, it followes not, that God receiveth from us a righteousnesse, we rather receive faish from God for our justification.

Our receiving faith from God, hindreth not that on our tender and his receiving it, God receives righteousnesse from us to our justification, which is denied.

3. Our imputation of faish supposeth a righteousnesse given unto men and received from God in justification, because it could not be truly said that God doth impune faish for righteousnesse, unto any man except he should make him righteous upon believeng. Now as it is impossible that a man should be made righteous without a righteousnesse in one kinde or other, so it's impossible that righteousnesse, whereby a man is made righteous in justification, should be given him from any bus G d; and this is forgiuenesse of sinnes.

If imputation of faith supposeth a righteousnesse given whereby man is made just in justification, then God in justification giveth a righteousnesse whereby and without which it's impossible that a man should be made just; and this must needs be that which formally justifieth; your words they are, I subscribe; the question will be what it is? either faith that's imputed, or remission of sinnes, or Christs righteousnesse active and passive.

Faith is not that 1. faith supposeth this. 2. Indeed
it's
Ccc

Whence cause ap- its that by which this is received, be it either righteous-
plicant tribuitur nesse or remission of sinnes. 3. It is not perfect righte-
quod proprie et ousnesse. Remission of sinnes cannot be it, for though
immediate perti- we receive it by faith, yet 1. it's but a consequent of ju-
nit ad rem appli- stification as before. And 2. Its no way righteousness,
cation, &c. Dr. it hath not the definition of it, and therefore cannot
Davies, p. 371. possibly be that which maketh righteous; the truth
explains that then is, that it's the righteousness of Christ, by it the
place, Rom. 4. 5, word faith, *we are confirmed righteous* as the word shew-
qua fides appre- eth, God *imputeth righteousness*. Faith takeing in this
hendit et applicat object by a Metalepsis, is granted imputed.
nobis Christi ju-

stitutam, id fidei
ipsi tribuitur
quod respice Chri-
sto Debeat.
Zacharias, neij;
azione fidei nostrae justificamur sed ea retantum, qua per fidem apprehenditur, qua est Christus cum
sua obedientia justificatur et sic illud intelligo creditur Abraham, &c. quid reputamus non actio
qua sed id mod credidit, sive ut alij loquantur, ipsa fides non sui apprehendatur, sed obiecti appre-
hensu recipiatur, in Zacharias on Phil. p. 3.

The difference will be then what righteousness, passive, or both active and passive; and thus this controverie being an other commeth in. I hold both and so must you, when the Active is an *essentia reguisit to the* *passives in versione sua esse*. Let these particulars be considered and they will notably tend to the streighting this Controversie.

What you further say you have answered, in that to Mr. Walkers are examined, and what you say in defence of your selfe not to be an *Arminian* and *Socinian* in this point, and the weaknesse of the charge that is laid on the contrary opinion, we have examined what is charged on the active obedience of Christ by *Praw* and *Piscator*, c. 2, sect. 8. conclus. 7. where Mr. *Gataker* is also mentioned, whither I remit the Reader and your selfe.

When you inferre, Impartiall men judging between both parts, would cleerly see to set the Saddle of Arminianisme and Socinianisme on Our opinion as the right Horse. I intreat Judgement and desire no favour Sir, Mr. *Gataker* accused by *Lueius* of that crime denied it on this ground he held the imputation of the passive

five obedience of Christ, *justitia imputata quam a Christo habemus iustificari nos cum ipso contra Socinum ex aequo agnoscimus*. sect. 84. sect alter. p. 8. n. 36. In that name himselfe and *Piscator* are free, Mr. *Wotton* and you his Scholler are left in the lurch, and *Parsons* is free, between whom and us though there be controversie, whether onely the Active and pative or both are imputed, to which you have to take for shelter of you in your opinion of the *locutio*, yet I suppose, *Piscator*, *Parsons* and Mr. *Gataker* abominiate your imputation of faith in a proper sence, denying a metonymick sence. I am sure *Parsons* telleth *Bellarmino* denying the metonimick sense, he did no: to much oppote *Wotton* in it, as blasphemē the Holy Ghost, of which before.

And I must tell you It's before the Reader to Judge how you have cleared your selfe of agreement in this, not onely with *Arminius* and *Socinus*, but with the Papists. In this you have a common partie, and it's a point of faith as you call it. And those not as points in which Papists and we agree but such as are defended by Papists, against the Reformed Churches, and controverted. Neither have we afflailed you meerly, with words but Scriptures also and Reasons. Neither are they calculated for the meridian of Women and Childrens temper alone, we professe no speciall skill in that, but for men of understanding, let them judge of them, and the Lord give true understanding.

*Just ita imputat
quam a Christi
habemus, iustifi-
cari nos cum ipso
contra to innam
et e quo agnoscim-
mus, p. 84. sect.
8. n. 3.*



CHAP. VII.

*Our Arguments are proposed (as you
may) and you desire acceptation of Answers
elsewhere given without repetition.*

YOUR INTRETY IS MINE OWN, LET ALL BE CONSIDERED TOGETHER.

1 Argu. If there be no standing in Judgement before God except we be indued with perfect righteousness, then must the righteousness of Christ be imputed to us in our justification.

But there is no standing for us, &c.

I deny the consequence, there may be no standing in judgements before God, and yet the righteousness of Christ, in the sense controverted not be imputed. Remission of sinnes purchased by the death of Christ is so, as in the 5. first conclusions, p. 3. & 4. Two our Divines as Calvin finde sufficient strenght for confidence in the death of Christ alone.

2. The righteousness of Christ asserted by us is his active and pallive obedience, what weakness is it then for you to assert his passive obedience by way of opposition unto us, and to deny imputation thereof. And I appeale to the Reader how you can exclude the active obedience of Christ, and separate it from the passive, which you assert the purchaser of pardon, when as your selfe call that active obedience *an essentiall requisite to constitute the passive obediēce meritorious.*

Calvin doth not exclude the imputation of Christs active obedience to the Law from Christs death; I appeale to what's answered before out of him.

2. Remission of sinnes is no righteousness, neither is it to be confounded as if it were the same with Christs death,

death, they are cause and effect : remission indeed is a consequent of Justification ; let the Reader observe the Reference.

2. Arg. He that is justified by an others righteousness must be justified by Christ's imputed, for no other righteousness is fit.

But every man that is justified is justified by the righteousness of an other, and not his own.

1. I deny the Major, a man may be justified by the righteousness of another, and yet no necessary of Christ's active obedience (of which only the question is) to be imputed to him, the passive obedience of Christ : by merit of which communicated in free pardon without further righteousness derived upon them in a way of imputation or however, of which see 4. or 5. Conclus. p. 3. 6. 7.

I answer, by the righteousness of Christ we meane active and passive, and I never read of one that held the active alone, you do but fight with a shadow.

2. And shewed but now that you putting the passive, cannot exclude the active, the passive without that is not meritorious and that the imputation of both are necessary to justification of which pardon is a consequent.

Your communicated and our imputed are one with us and with you, or else with Mr. ~~Wynne~~ and ~~Sacram~~ you deny imputation of Christ's passive obedience in which you are deserted even by Mr. Gataker, &c.

To the Minor, by affliction, a man may be said to be justified by the righteousness of another and not his own : farther 1. by way of merit, or 2. by way of forme, whosever is justified by the righteousness of another and not his own, is justified by the merit of the righteousness of another and not his own.

In the latter sens^e it's altogether untrue, for the righteousness wherwith a man is formally justified is alwaies his own by donation and possession and not anothers, except onely in respect of procurement Christ's, or collation, and so it's Gods Remission of sinnes wherby a believer is formally (as often) as a man is in such a sense as reparation or faith.

Every man that's justified, is justified by the righteousness of an other, and not his own, the distinction is Saint Pauls, 1 Philip 3: and answer, that that which doth formally justify is also meritorious, it cannot justify applied, that hath not worth and merit in it, as ours truly teach.

Christs rig. teouisnle we grant as the materiall to the meritorious cause, and it imputed that which supplieth the place of a forme. So nothing that is our own (inherent in us) is or can be.

Righteouinenesse may be laid to be his own, and man formally justified either inherently as Faith, Hope, and Charity, *which* are not only given but by way of infusion, and so inhere onely in those to whom it's given, or else by imputation, so as the sinne inhering in such as believe is Christs, layd on him as in the Type, and so is the righteouinenesse which is in him subjectivly, is ours given by God, and received by us, this also is given by God, ours by his donation and possesyon as Christ is, who dwelling in us by faith is the subject of it.

Now by formally you may know (and do acknowledge somewhere I remember) we meane not inherently, that's the Popish forme of Justification which we oppose; this is so our own as it is not anothers, so is my Faith, and Hope and Charity.

And you shall never prove that we are justified by that which is so our own and no others.

That we are justified by, is Christs inherently or subjectivly only, though ours by donation and possesyon, not subjectivly further then as Christ in whom it is dwelleth in us, by his Spirit and faith, it's his and ours as he is the Lord our righteousness made unto us righteousnesse.

Remission of sinnes, though ours by Christs procurement and Gods donation received by faith, is no righteouisenesse, as hath been answered and proved, and being

ing a consequent of Justification as hath been answered and proved, can never formally justifie. it cannot be before and after justification, neither doth it inhere in man as Faith and Hope, nor can it therfore be so our own, as they are.

The Argument you may read in *Chamier, de justit.*
c. 17.

Justificatio per alienam justitiam, est imputativa. At nostra justificatio est per alienam in justitiam. which he proveth and defendeth against *Papists.* ibid.

3. Argum. If believers have a true and reall communion with Christ, then is his righteousness theirs by imputation. But the former is certaine, therefore.

1. The proposition wants truth, because a true and reall communion with Christ may stand without his active obedience being made theirs by imputation, see c. 10. sect 4. & 5. of the former par c. 2. p. 9. & 10. of this 2. par.

The question is what maketh man righteous; we assert the active and passive obedience of Christ imputed or given us, and applied by faith: we adde this is done by reall Communion, for so our finnes are counted actually to him, and his righteousness to us. It becommeth ours for making us just. To your exception, Communion is denied where his active obedience is not made ours. It's a demonstration, Communion is the cause, Christs active obedience it's being, ours the effect, it's like that of the Apostle; *as many of us as are Baptized into Christ, are Baptized into his death.* 6. Rom. 3. the difference is, his death is named, and not his active obedience: It's not excluded more then his Resurrection; and if it infloweth and concurreth, be an essential requisite, to the efficacy of his death. With what face can you granting the one, deny the other? Imputation then is the businesse: but imputation of Christs passive obedience is granted to us by *Piscator, Parens, and Mr. Gataker,* we are altogether here against *Socinus and Mr. Watson,* and you being Judge, the essentiall requisite cannot be

beliefs ours. Impputation is nothing else but that act of God wherby he applieth that to us that believe, be not offended with those that speake thus with Saint Paul 4. Ro. 6. 11. who as he saith, by the *obedience of Christ we are made righteous*, c. 5. faith, when God justifieth *he imputeth righteousness*. Let the Reader see your places examined.

And Sir, if the feet be sinnefull, they need righteousness, and if they are made righteousness (not having of their own else) it must be by the righteousness of the head, communicated or applied to the same. Once the Apostle saith, *we are compleat in him who is the head*, 2 Col. where we see it a truth of the body and by Communion.

2. *If wants reason, it hath neither colour nor shew of truth in it, that the union and Communion which believers have with Christ, should of necessity imply or draw with it the appropriation of his active obedience by way of imputation, at least such an one, as is the golden Apple, &c. c. that is so, that it becomes thence formal righteousness, either in whole or in part, for what difference can be assigned out of that union and Communion which intercreds between Christ and a believer; why rather the active obedience or righteousness of Christ than the wisdom or power or glory of Christ should be made the believers by imputation.*

The question is of justifying; that it may be done, there must be righteousness, the Scripture saith, that *by Christ's obedience we shall be confirmed righteous*, and the Scripture doth tell us of imputation therof. So is Christ made unto us, of God righteousness. The wisdom, power, glory of Christ, though they have place in my Justification, &c. yet do not as his righteousness make me just, and the Scripture which teaching imputation of righteousness, mentioneth neither the imputation of his wisdom, power or glory, we are wise according to what is written.

5 Arg. If there be no other end reason or necessity why

why Christ should fulfill the Law, but only that this obediency them unto might be imputed unto us for a righteous in our justification. Then is at the imputation that end dropped.

But no other end, or necessity, can be given.
But,

1. *The former Proposition is unsound; there are other ends.* 2. *The grace, & Atonement, & his Doctrine, he did what he thought.* 3. *The God of glory, therefore, he did it as a debtor unto all mankind, and as mediator to that Law.* 3. *For exemplification;* v. Eph. 2. 4. *In damnation & imputation.* 5. *It keeps him in God's favour,* v. 5. *John. 10.* 6. *It is of absolute necessity, to sacrifice the Saviour to the Altar, &c. which is largely argued for by the author,* *concerning all those things wherein we are liable, & deserved imputation, and judgment against us, & the remission of the same,* *which is fully proved in it.* 7. *It qualified him eternally, as his Priesthood.* 8. *His own command.* 4. *John. 3. 4.* Therefore the Argument from the unsoundness of it, otherwise is weaker. Besides you deny that he did the Law, as a debtor to himself, and that which it might say else that the holyness of Christ is an offspring of such a view of both *necessities*.

I answer, I know none that urge this argument, and that there was no other end. Neither is it needfull whenas you press all these, to followe but that our justification was not an end: and that this was an end with the rest, that necessary concurrence which you here plead, and calling it *essentiall requisite* to Christ's sufferings for justification sheweth it, which inflowing, and concurring produceth the effect by imputation, or application. God imputing it to us, and our applying it by Faith. That this was his end is evident, where it is said that by the righteousness of one many shall be made righteous, which is never attained, but by imputation or application.

5. *Arg.* Because we are debtors to the Law in punishment and perfect obedience also, otherwise our fining against the Law should exempt and priviledge us

us from subjection to the Law.

This minor I name because the major hath nothing said to it, and you say,

It laboureth of ambiguity, when it saith, we are debtors to the Law in perfection of obedience, as well as in matter of punishment, it may be true and false. If the meaning be believers are debtors to the Law in perfection of obedience so justification it's utterly false, there's no need to depend on it. It's freely by blood, 5. Rom. 9. Neither are they debtors in regard of punishment, Christ having born it.

If it's true, unbelievers are debtors in both respects, if they mean to be justified, otherwise then by Christ, because there's no third way, he must keep the whole himselfe.

Unbelievers as you say are debtors in both, to do and suffer to justification. Very well, their suretie then must pay their debt, if he will be their justifier he must suffer he must fulfill the Law.

Put Christ doing and suffering, and man a believer, I yeeld he is not bound to do, to live, he was before faith, by faith, being a partaker of the satisfaction of Christ.

God accounting the same unto him, it's as if he had satisfied, his surety hath don it, he then is acquitted, freed from death, freed from strict rigorous performance of the Law to Justification from personall obedience, this is what we say.

When we speake of Christs blood, it's our minde. But you must not exclude his active obedience, that fulfilling of the Law (which is *eterna lex* and *eterna obligationis* to life, (being my debt : and where is the merit of that blood if it be without Christs obedience to the Law, which you call *it's essentiall requisite to our life?*

2. You have our meaning, our question is to justification: and though obedience by sanctification as gratitude be granted by us a debt, yea and in order of nature in some degree before justification as conditioning faith, and qualifying the person to the promise, we intend it not in this question, what you say in the 3. place.

3. We are not privileged from keeping the Law no not in respect of justification because we have transgressed it, but are incapable of such keeping, whether personally or by imputation, which may amount to justification. 2. and that the release we have from such obstruction to justification accrueth to us to justification, by Christ's death for us. Rom. 7. 4.

1. If transgrefors are not privileged from that obedience in respect of Justification, It's their debt still, and must be satisfied.

2. Though we are incapable of observation, such as amounteth to justification, & exemption from punishment, whether personall or imputed, by the death of Christ, whence we have freedome from punishment; yet death being not all, it's insufficient to satisfy; and where there is an impossibility of what is personall, imputation is necessary, both are our debt, our sureties satisfaction is of both, and your selfe grant, Christ's death insufficent without the concurrence of his active obedience, as an essentiall requisite; you cannot exclude it, ther's hope you may come over, you must or eat your own grant. You say,

4. God never required of any man but onely Christ exact obedience to the Law and subjection to punishment due, constraines, but divisive onely, the Law saith, do this and live, and he is not threatened that judg'leth, punishment is an supposition of sinnes.

You grant God required both of Christ together, why? but because hee was our surety, and bore our debt, to our freedome from punishment and life, Both were necessary, therefore required of him, therefore hee tooke our nature and obeyed to death.

3. A sinner we speake of, and he is a debtor of both, he oweth subjection to punishment for sinnes simply, for his inability to obey. He oweth obedience to life, Gods Law is a Minister of death to such, and promiseth not life but to doing, it concerneth Christ because of us, us as principals, him as our suretie. Your selfe said but now.

It's true, those that believe in Christ, among other faults, in this sense is he debitor unto the Law, as much as we are; yet fulfill obedience as of penitentnes of shew, means to be justified, and of shew proffersmen otherwise thereby Christ; p. 209.

Then both are required, conjunction of them, as well as their turety, and therfore of their turety.

You adde,

15. If a man bath sinned, and suffered (by himselfe or other for him) he is no further a debtor than he is in point of justification; because he cannot be of equal consideration under Law, to absolute confirmation. So that as a man is or never was or can be, under fulfillethe Law, riper for his justification. So there's no reason then, he has bath suffered to the full, the penalty of the Law, which suffering is every wayes, as farre as beloueth to the Law, a perfect obedience, and of course the same conderation, it is so requireth a double satisfaction.

1. In point of justification life is infolded, and in case a man suffereth by himselfe or another, howe suffering is not equivalent to exact obedience, towards maintenance of his life, it's seene in the Divell and damned, who suffer for themselves, they are farre from justification or life. Has fulfilled not the Law once to life, who onely suffereth and doth not.

So that we being unable, it being impossible to us to fulfill the Law, either waye soe life, you see an absolute necessity of Christ our Sureties doing and suffering to our life; so omit the insufficiency of either without the other. You can never escape this Argument.

6. Argv. But there can be no justification without a perfect righteousness, nearely diuers inconsciente found but onely the righteousness of Christ performed to the Law. To this as guilty and weake you answer.

7. Though it be true that justification cannot take place without a perfect righteousness being made off him, making a man perfectly righteous, yet such a tale of allas Christ performed to be Mewall Law deservingly, is one of any absolute necessity;

justify them so, for if the Law were justified by Christ's righteousness, the Ceremonial Law also might be included, as before, 3 Tr. c. 18. p. 3.

1. I take what is granted, and that there's no justification without perfect righteousness, it's of good use; it's our minor proposition in part.

2. I know none limiting Christ's obedience to the Morall Law, it was to whatevver, though that was a perfect rule of life, and as for the Ceremonial Law it was reducible to the 2 Commandement, as God manner of Worship, so that this aliquid is not against what we urge, see the place wherunto you referre.

3. It's not absolutely true, there's no perfect righteousness to be found but only that of Christ, there is a sufficient and complete righteousness in the Death of Christ, and it's more probable that God furnisheth them out of the Law it selfe for Christ's sake, then that he should require Christ's rather. See c. 2. sect. 5. & c. 5. sect. 3. 3 par. *This means remission of sinnes.*

1. Remission is no righteousness. 2. 'Tis not in the Law. 3. Such as have it are not furnished out of the Law with it, see the places examined.

3. *Perfect righteousness wherein justification consisteth, and wherein all men are made formally just, is reaching the due remission of sinnes, as in 3. & 4. c. of this par. & c. 5. sect. 3. 3 par. & c. 4. sect. 28. of this latter, and that Calvin excludeth not only Regeneration but all other things whatsoever, and that others bring burrid blappes on his hand.*

This third is the same with the second many times urged, and answered. See the places I appeal.

Sect. 16. *It is so saying it is equivalent to, and virtually contains both absolute obedience to the Law, as hath been demonstrated, c. 3. p. 4. 2. par.*

See it there answered.

3. *It may bear the name of righteousness, and that which is complete, because it bath shewynge of Christ's righteousness, as elsewhere,*

There it's answered, so faith should be perfect righteousness, I and charity in it's place, it hath the promises of priviledges, and that's enough as your selfe though it hath not the nature and essence of a perfect righteouinesse, what if it hath the name so long as it hath not the essence? but it hath not the name neither will similitude serve the turne, as there is shewed.

This Argument doth not complaine but glory it hath no satisfaction, seeing there's no other righteousness.

7 Argv. Do this and live is an everlasting rule, therefore the active obedience of Christ must be imputed to Justification.

This is a truth, you answer.

I grant it an everlasting Rule, he that doth it shall live, but this is not to purpose, it's without the face of an Argument, because whosoever abideth, &c. shall live whether the righteousness of Christ be imputed yea or no. I deny it either is, ever was, or will be, a perpetuall rule for men to be Justified by, and that be only that doth this can be said to be justified, for God hath alwaies had an other, believe this and live, see c. 4. 1 par. and answer to Gal. 3. 10. c. 5. 1. par.

If this be an everlasting truth, hee that doth this shall live, that is perfectly fulfill the Law, it's as everlasting that he that doth it not shall never live.

None can do and live without the imputation of Christ's righteousness.

This I finde Mr. Perkins his Argument, That very thing that must be our righteousness before God must satisfie the Inster of the Law which saith, do this and live. Now there is nothing can satisfie the Inster of the Law but the righteousness of obedience of Christ for us, See it in Mr. Wottons defence, p. 170.

If it be a rule of life everlasting, it is of justification, and must be answered as debt by our selves or sur. ty.

2. God hath not alwaies had that believe and live, or else God required faith in Christ of Adam in innocency expressely,

expressly, and God did never require do this and live.
Or else they are both one.

3. Believing to life is believing in the Lord Jesus, applying his perfect doings and sufferings, it's an instrument or hand taking in Christs righteousness, not opposed to it, or excluding of the object, so all as before, and let the Reader see your former deeds this way in those places examined.

8. Arg. That righteousness which God accepteth in our behalfe is the righteousness imputed to us in justification. But the righteousness of Christ is that which God accepteth on our behalfe.

You deny the Major and distinguish on the Minor. The reason of the first is because God may and doth accept for us which he needs not impute, as the prayer of Abraham for Isaack.

So these for whom Christs sufferings were accepted, receive unspeakable benefits by them, yet it followeth not God looks on them as if they had personally endured, which is the imputation specially opposed in this Treatise, but because they be the sufferings of his Sonne.

1. The proposition is firme, that he accepteth to justification is righteousness imputed.

2. God accepteth not *Abrahams* prayer to *Isaacs* justification, or the justification of any other. Perfect righteousness doth it. God accepteth no other, and there's no way else to have it but Gods imputation.

3. Those for whom God accepteth Christs death, have Christs death imputed to them to justification and are looked on as men that have satisfied, not by their own personall sufferings, but those of his Sonne our Surety.

2. To be Minor, If by obedience is meant that be performed to the Common Law considered a part from that be performed to the Law of a Mediator. It's false, for God did not accept that on those terms to justify us with it or for it, as hath been ten times said and proved.

If you make his suffering a badiment, so it may be granted, but then it will be a paradoxie with attorneyes.

D. We intane Christe active and Passive obedience as hath been told you twenty times and thus we commend due in Christ as a surety by the Law of mediation.

We say what he did to the Morall Law was our debt, which our surety must pay, that we may live, it's part of his obedience by which we are made righteous.

When you grant it of his sufferings, how can you exclude his obedience to the Morall Law, teaching the world that his obedience was an ~~finalia~~ ^{finalia} requisita to the benefit of justification, and it's no paralogisme.

9 Arg. If Christ were a publique person standing in the place of all those that should believe in him, then all he did and suffered is computed as done and suffered by these, and imputed to them. But Christ was o're.

D. The Major is mostly and untrue, his standing in the place of fuls or vice is no ground that all that he did and suffered are imputed as done and suffered by them, as his incarnation, birth, circumcision, subjection to Joseph, &c. Redempcion of the world, why should I, a following disciple be looked on as one circumcised, what advantage has it to me, to be looked on in Christ as one that was subject to Joseph, how should I grieve and trouble the world, when God should look on me as having redeemed the world out of the greatest o're Christ did.

This argument is put in publique words, not proper to dilgrace it, whose it is, as layd down I know not, but think it your own.

I would put it. That which Christ did and suffered as the surety of believers in their stead, which they were debtors in to God; that's looked on as done and suffered by them, there's by imputation, the Scripture fowreth him our surety: this is our Churche's language; and it is Dr. Davenant's Arg.

Qui sponsor pro nobis factus est atque tenet nostrum debet solutio-
nem in se suscepit, illius obedi-
entia que justitia nobis imparta-
tur, ex imputata
valet eque ac si
propria et nobis inherens fuisset.
Ser p. 370.

Christum autem ordinatum et acceptatum a deo pro sponsorate no-
stris ostendatur
Apolitus. 7 H. 33.

At Christus nostro nomine non modo subivit per peccationem crucis sed etiam implexione Legis. Quando agitur in j. 14 vero, siue dubitum Legis a me exigatur, offendendo fiduciem meam hoc debito excoluisse, atque proinde me liberare esse a peccato. Chirographum illud quo obligatus tenuerat, delatum esse et abrogatum. *1 Cor. 14.*

Atque sic Christi justitia nulli predicti aut justificati perirent nulli in ea reparatione aut prolixa pauperi, at nec hunc est supplicare vocata causa formalis, unde compliciti dicimus in Christo non invenimus.

Had you taken our Arguments as layd downe and urged but this Doctor, it would have beene somewhat such hungry laying them downe as is found in you, leaveth out their hart, and is not ingenuous.

And here we may see how what you object would vanish, redemption of the world was none of my debt, It's enough that in him I have redenption.

2. It hath beene demonstrated that it's not truth to say the sufferings of Christ are locked on as mine, as may be said he suffered in my stead, we cannot be said to be punished for the same sinnes in and with Christ for which we have remissed in his death, as Dr. Willet.

1. Your demonstrations (as you love to speake) are all examined, and that in it's place.

2. We say no more but that he suffered in our stead, *it is, perinde ac si in me operata, aut a me proposita fuisse.*

What my surety doeth, is as if I had done it, and so our Homily, every Christian man in him and by him may be called a fulfller of the Law, wher was lacking in us being supplied by him.

3. The issue of the busynesse is not all, our question is not about the effect, justification, pardon, life. But that by which; which is granted to be by satisfaction made to God our Creditor by our surety Christ, which as it was performed for us, is ours imputed as the Scripture, the word saith, we have it by fellowship with his blood. And with his obedience to death, by his obedience we are made righteous, which you say,

4. It's not so found a drift as supposed, that Christ stood in the stead or place of believers, in a thing performed by him.... Christ did a thousand things and suffered many of which we had no necessary use to be borne of us.

1. This is the lame with the first, as it's layd downe out of the Doctor, there are no such unlimited words, but as our surety, and as satisfaction for our debt.

That we keepe our selves to, we say Christ for us; and we say that he was obedient that by is we may be made righte-

righteousness : You will us to see, &c. 3. sect. 11. of the 2.
part. Which you shall find examined.

2. If Christ suffered many things we have no need
of tell us whether it was for himselfe, or whom, or in
vaine

Arg. Yo. If we cannot be justified by the righteous-
nesse of Christ otherwise then by imputation of it, then
must it needs be imputed to us in our justification.

But there's no way of being justified, but onely by the
imputation of it.

You answere.

The active obedience of Christ hath influence otherwise, qua-
lifying the person for the sacrifice of himselfe, by which justifi-
cation is purchased, as before. That it's not by imputation hath
been proved by 3. demonstrations and 4. and that our quiver is
well nigh exhaust. I know not 2. Arguments more really dif-
fering.

1. Your Demonstrations against imputation are all
examined.

2. Put that influence of the active obedience in to
the sacrifice of Christ to make it propitiatory. I hope
it doth not deny imputation, that's granted by chole
that hold onely Christ's passive obedience : It's urged
and observed by them that they may not be accounted
Serious, nor numbered with them. I fee you will leave
them there, and be so your selfe if you deny the impu-
tation of Christ's righteousness.

The Scripture layeth down imputation of righte-
ousness, which is Gods way of application, his giving
it to us, clothing us with it, without which we shall ne-
ver be the better for it. And it followeth, not that our
quiver is exhaust because you know no more, one may
judge you willingly ignorant. Let any man read our
Worthies in this question against Papists, and hee shall
read many arguments untouched ; I wile Arrowes fea-
sthered and headed and shot in an other manner of bow,
by an other manner of arme then is presented by you.

They

They stick in the Babylonians sides, and you and they shall never be able to pluck them off.

To omit that there's not one, but is managed against your gamelaying. But I will not word it
sd 12 and 13. If we may be said truly to be dead with Christ, crucified, quickened raised, and to sit in in heavenly places with Christ, then may we be truly said to have fulfilled the Law with Christ also (there's no difference) and consequently it's imputed to us and counted ours.

But we may be, &c. I protest against this Majors consequence, &c.

Whose this is I know not, nor am I bound to spend time about it. It may be you made it as a man of clouts your selfe, or mared it otherwise made, that you might shoot at it: the force that's aimed at (if I misse not) is to the same purpose, that we have spoken to in that head of Communion of which enough, and so let passe to your last named argument.

Arg. 12 Who soever is a sinner and so continueth whilst he lives cannot be justified otherwise then by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. But every man, Christ only excepted is so:

You Answer.

If then be no other way or meanes the condition of the world is miserable, for such there's none, as hath been proved, beyond all reasonable deniall, except I be mistake.

But blessed be the Father of mercies. — who taketh that Ray back opened an effectuall door of Justification for sinners, believers are not under the Law but grace and there's no condemnation in them, and if any man sinnes we have an Advocate, &c. Dissolving guilt needs no imputation of the old law obediency; the propitiation by blood back doth this service, before the imputation is supposed to come at them. The merits of Christ's death is not so farre exhorting pardam that it will not serve to accep-
tation, &c. Adoption is from his blood. The perfect holynesse of his person and righteounesse of his life presupposed as back been
back

said. He that hath communion with his death shall not know what to doe with the imputation of his life, after it, but enough if not more then enough of this before.

Here's enough indeed, and more then enough of this;

1. Let the Reader judge an otherwhile, you may be mistaken, and in a miserable case, being so professed an enemy to imputation, and the cause of mistake to so many others.

2. Who questions believers being under grace, or faith that they have condemnation? &c. will not these stand with imputation of righteousness? are you alone the Dr. of those conclusions? are your adversaries, enemies to those conclusions? you take too much upon you.

3. Dissolving guilt needs imputation of righteousness; nay, thence followeth non-imputation of sinne as the Apostle, *And Paracelsus answreth Papists* as before.

4. Dissolution of sinnes guilt by Christ's blood before imputation is dissolution before application; that which putteth the effect before the cause, your friends will not hould with you.

5. Let the merit of Christ's death be infinite if it be not applied, imputed by God, received by us, it will not have any effect, there's neither pardon, nor adoption; there must be communion with his death first, before there be the effects, which is by imputation.

And who seeth not but that despised things, the holynesse of Christ's person and righteousness of his life are supposed by your selfe, to this efficacy of his blood, *to make it a Sacrifice to Justification, that without which Christ's death was in vain?* and must there not be fellowship with it, bloods essentiall requisite also.

Fellowship with one and other are together, not first with death then life, the issues are from both imputed or given to us, received by faith. Will you separate blood and it's essentiall requisite, or communion with them to Justification? you cannot.

And

And now you make an end with, *we have overcome,*
and yet I am not satisfied, and I have laboured to give
you an account therof, the issue I leave to God, praying
in your forme; The Lord by his Spirit leade us in to
the way of truth and keepe us that we turne not aside
either to the right or left hand, that we may be sound-
ly built up in our holy faith and fitted for his everlast-
ing Kingdome. *Amen.*

FINIS.

ERRATA.

and the sea, so diverse has no plant ever been seen
before. I have heard of but one botanical name and that being
that of *Desmodium* which is a trifoliate leguminous plant
which grows on the hillsides and in the fields. It is a
small plant, about 12 inches high, with trifoliate leaves,
each leaf having three small leaflets, and flowers of a
yellowish green colour, and which flowers are very
attractive.

ERRATA.

Addit: v. arg. p. 42. 1 Par. for first, p. 49, p. 2 second a par. for justitiam iustitiae, p. 12. for which righteousia p. 3. p. 16. no to himself hoc us, read *C h i s* p. 19.

2 Par. in the Conclusions, Errata.

For comprehensive, p. 76, par. 1. 26. read comprehenfor. and in the se: 27. for hypothetice hypothatique. and p. 77. for even ours. l. 2. and for quam quia, ib. l. 11. for Lawes p. 78. read Law. for meate read none. l. 21. for truth, p. 8. *permitt-* l. which for Duncian r. *Dowmian*. p. 22. for in, p. 24. 2 par. as, for in or. p. 87. l. 24. for and, p. 88. one, l. 11. for for, p. 88. l. 18. so, dele by. l. 29. ibid. for false, false, p. 89. l. 13. for corpe, corpori. p. 89. for after both parts read finalification for before. p. 91. for propitiation r. propagation, p. 92. for for, as *ibid.* l. 10. for, 8. 5. Rom. p. 93. for Christ, Christi. p. 94. 4. 1. for fear, read, p. 95. for depri, deprivation. p. 95. l. 33. for *Ind.* l. 6. p. 97. addle, is after will. p. 97. l. 10. for, when, then. p. 100. l. 7. dele *ad*. p. 106. for, for, so, p. 107. for marvelous, meritorious. p. 110. addle, or, we are or, p. 112. l. 2. for one, our. p. 113. 20. for nad, had. *ibid.* l. 17. for Papist, Popish. p. 113. l. 2. dele, part of. p. 119. l. 2. and 5. in its *ibid.* and read for, in, is, *ibid.* for our the, *ibid.* l. 4. for 15. 20. *ibid.* dele that, *ibid.* l. 24. for our the, *ibid.* l. 17. dele, in the Margent. p. 12. for quadrplex, quadruplex. p. 120. for Coffee, Tasse. from folio 120. to 127. mend what's amisse. for which with p. 124. amended. p. 125. addle in p. 128. 31. for good God. p. 141. l. 21. *ibid.* addle or, of Christ or, l. 17. for our are, p. 149. l. 14. dele her. 150. for minis-
tration, ministerum. p. 168. folio in right from fol. 119. to 113. for *libertines liberatio-*
nem. p. 169. for iatiolent infolvent p. par. 2. p. 64. l. 18. Ceremonie for Ceremonius
p. 189. for mercifull, unmercifull, p. 189. l. 21. for oculum position, p. 193. for
put in poite, 194. read recipie, p. 193. and Socinus for Socinian, p. 203. and put
out, nor p. 204. l. 8. dele, it, p. 205. l. 17. righteous for righteousciple, p. 208. p. 9.